


Withdrawn From
Charles E. [unclear] Library
Connecticut College



THE INSTITUTE OF ECONOMICS

The Carnegie Corporation of New York in establishing the Institute of Economics declared:

"The Carnegie Corporation, in committing to the Trustees the administration of the endowment, over which the Corporation will have no control whatsoever, has in mind a single purpose—namely, that the Institute shall be conducted with the sole object of ascertaining the facts about current economic problems and of interpreting these facts for the people of the United States in the most simple and understandable form. The Institute shall be administered by its Trustees without regard to the special interests of any group in the body politic, whether political, social, or economic."

THE BROOKINGS INSTITUTION

The Brookings Institution—Devoted to Public Service Through Research and Training in the Humanistic Sciences—was incorporated on December 8, 1927. Broadly stated, the Institution has two primary purposes: The first is to aid constructively in the development of sound national policies; and the second is to offer training of a super-graduate character to students of the social sciences. The Institution will maintain a series of co-operating institutes, equipped to carry out comprehensive and inter-related research projects.

Final responsibility for the final determination of the Institution's policies and its program of work and for the administration of its endowment is vested in a self-perpetuating Board of Trustees. The Trustees have, however, defined their position with reference to the investigations conducted by the Institution in a by-law provision reading as follows: "The primary function of the Trustees is not to express their views upon the scientific investigations conducted by any division of the Institution, but only to make it possible for such scientific work to be done under the most favorable auspices." Major responsibility for "formulating general policies and co-ordinating the activities of the various divisions of the Institution" is vested in the President. The by-laws provide also that "there shall be an Advisory Council selected by the President from among the scientific staff of the Institution and representing the different divisions of the Institution."

BOARD OF TRUSTEES

EDWIN A. ALDERMAN
ROBERT S. BROOKINGS
WHITEFOORD R. COLE
FREDERIC A. DELANO
GEORGE EASTMAN
RAYMOND B. FOSDICK
FRANK J. GOODNOW
JEROME D. GREENE
ARTHUR T. HADLEY

ERNEST M. HOPKINS
DAVID F. HOUSTON
VERNON KELLOGG
SAMUEL MATHER
JOHN C. MERRIAM
HAROLD G. MOULTON
JOHN BARTON PAYNE
LEO S. ROWE
BOLTON SMITH

PAUL M. WARBURG

OFFICERS

ROBERT S. BROOKINGS, *Chairman*
LEO S. ROWE, *Vice Chairman*
FREDERIC A. DELANO, *Treasurer*
HAROLD G. MOULTON, *President*

ADVISORY COUNCIL (1928-29)


CHARLES O. HARDY
ROBERT R. KUCZYNSKI
LEWIS L. LORWIN
LEVERETT S. LYON

EDWIN G. NOURSE
THOMAS WALKER PAGE
FREDERICK W. POWELL
WILLIAM F. WILLOUGHBY

LABOR AND INTERNATIONALISM

BY

LEWIS L. LORWIN



New York

THE MACMILLAN COMPANY

1929

331.87

L895

COPYRIGHT, 1929,
By THE BROOKINGS INSTITUTION.

Set up and printed.
Published March, 1929.

All rights reserved, including the right of reproduction
in whole or in part in any form.



SET UP BY BROWN BROTHERS LINOTYPERS
PRINTED IN THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
BY THE CORNWALL PRESS

Each investigation conducted under the auspices of The Brookings Institution is in a very real sense an institutional product. Before a suggested project is undertaken it is given thorough consideration, not only by the Director and the staff members of the Institute in whose field it lies, but also by the Advisory Council of The Brookings Institution. As soon as the project is approved, the investigation is placed under the supervision of a special Committee consisting of the Director of the Institute and two or more selected staff members.

It is the function of this supervising Committee to advise and counsel with the author in planning the analysis and to give such aid as may be possible in rendering the study worthy of publication. The Committee may refuse to recommend its publication by the Institution, if the study turns out to be defective in literary form or if the analysis in general is not of a scholarly character. If, however, the work is admittedly of a scholarly character and yet members of the Committee, after full discussion, cannot agree with the author on all phases of the analysis, the book will be published in the form desired by the author, with the disagreeing Committee member or members writing a criticism of the points in issue for publication as an appendix.

After the book is approved by the Institute for publication a digest of it is placed before the Advisory Council of The Brookings Institution. The Advisory Council does not undertake to revise or edit the manuscript, but each member is afforded an opportunity to criticize the analysis and, if so disposed, to prepare a dissenting opinion.

DIRECTOR'S PREFACE

In many directions economic, social, and political forces and movements are being conceived and organized with a view to co-operative action along international lines. One of the earliest and the most dramatic of these movements has been that which, for almost a century, has been enrolled under the banner of "Workers of the World, Unite". This book tells the story of that movement. It traces the origin of the idea of international labor co-operation, the successive attempts to embody it in functional organizations, the effect that it has had on world history, and the complex systems of international associations which seek to make the idea a living reality today.

In our time these international activities of labor are almost entirely misconceived, when not ignored. In the popular mind the internationalism of labor is generally identified with the Third International. In better informed circles, there is more or less adequate information about the International Labor Office or one or another of the international labor organizations. There has never existed, however, in any language, a systematic and comprehensive account of the international labor movement as a whole

—of its subdivisions, its internal struggles, and its meaning to world relations in general. This gap is filled by Dr. Lorwin's book herewith presented by the Institute of Economics. In the light of the facts and of his analysis, the Third International appears in its true perspective, as do all the other organizations which, though less spectacular and alarming, may have no less importance for the social history of the world.

While containing a comprehensive survey of the social radicalism of today in its world aspects, *Labor and Internationalism* is primarily concerned with the analysis of the capacity and validity of what is called workers' internationalism. The historical sections of the volume—as well as Book II—bring out clearly the difficulties which labor has faced in its efforts to build up an internationalism of mind and interests, and the limitations which political and economic facts impose upon all international ideals.

In the course of his investigation, Dr. Lorwin twice visited most of the countries of Europe and interviewed trade union leaders, politicians, statesmen, economists, government officials, and "rank and file" members of labor organizations. He was accorded kindly assistance everywhere—for which the Institute of Economics and the author wish to express their appreciation and gratitude to all and to every single person individually.

In the preparation of Parts II, III, and IV, and of Chapter XIX, the author had the assistance of

Jean A. Flexner, to whose splendid abilities and valuable co-operation he feels it a pleasure, as well as a duty, to pay tribute. The investigation, as a whole, has been under the supervision of a committee consisting of the Director, Robert R. Kuczynski, Isador Lubin, and Leverett S. Lyon.

HAROLD G. MOULTON,
Director.

Institute of Economics,
November, 1928.

CONTENTS

	PAGE
DIRECTOR'S PREFACE	vii
INTRODUCTION	1

BOOK I—THE STORY

PART I. THE TRADITION, 1830-1880

CHAPTER

I. THE TEEMING MASS OF IDEAS, 1830-1848 . .	11
I. Anticipations	11
II. Lovett and Blanqui	16
III. The "Hot Air" Forties	19
IV. From Flora Tristan to Karl Marx . .	23
II. THE FIRST INTERNATIONAL, 1864-1876 . . .	29
I. French Traditions and British Realism .	29
II. St. Martin's Hall	32
III. Inaugural and Constitution	36
IV. The First International Labor Congress	40
V. Years of Growth	43
VI. The Triumph of Marx	49
VII. Decline and Dissolution	51
VIII. The Legend and the Facts	57

PART II. PEACE AND PROGRESS, 1880-1914

III. THE SECOND INTERNATIONAL, 1889-1914 . .	63
I. Possibilists, Impossibilists, Pure and Simple	65
II. Separating the Sheep from the Goats .	68
III. New Variations on an Old Theme . .	73

CHAPTER	PAGE
1. Reform and Revolution	73
<i>a.</i> Alexander Millerand and Jean Jaurès	77
<i>b.</i> Karl Kautsky and Eduard Bernstein	77
2. Trade Unions and Socialism	79
3. Marxism, Revisionism, Syndicalism, Trade Unionism	82
IV. The Parliament of the Proletariat . . .	83
1. Credo and Organization	83
2. Congresses and Leadership	85
3. The International Socialist Bureau . .	87
V. Cohesion and Conflict	88
1. Nationalism and Internationalism . .	88
2. War and Peace	89
3. The Way of Compromise	92
VI. Storm Signals	93
IV. INTERNATIONAL LABOR SECRETARIATS . . .	97
I. Trade Secretariats	97
II. The International Secretariat of Trade Union Centers	100
1. French Failure and German Success	100
2. Clashing Types of Trade Unionism .	102
3. Statistics and Strike Aid	106
4. International Letter Box	110
5. German Leadership	112
III. Other Organizations	114
1. The International Labor Office . .	114
2. The Christian International . . .	115
V. AMERICAN-EUROPEAN LABOR RELATIONS, 1881-1914	117
I. Hands Across the Seas	117
II. Gompers and the Second International	118
III. Correspondence and Collections . . .	121
IV. The Turn in the Road	123
V. America's Part	128

CONTENTS

xiii

CHAPTER		PAGE
VI.	THE GREAT FAILURE	134
	I. The Turn-about	136

PART III. WAR AND REVOLUTION, 1914-1924

VII.	THE ORIGIN OF THE THIRD INTERNATIONAL, 1914-1919	149
	I. Right, Center, Left	150
	II. Zimmerwald	153
	III. "On to Stockholm!"	157
	IV. Enter the Bolsheviki	162
	V. The Bern Conference	166
	VI. The "International of Action"	168
VIII.	THE INTERNATIONAL FEDERATION OF TRADE UNIONS, 1914-1919	174
	I. Friendly Enemies	175
	II. Drifting Apart	178
	III. Leeds and Bern	181
	IV. Gompers versus Europe	185
	V. Bern and Versailles	188
	VI. The New I. F. T. U.	191
IX.	WORLD UPHEAVAL, 1919-1920	197
	I. Post-War Unrest	197
	1. Labor's Part	198
	2. The Main Currents	200
	3. Reconstruction or Revolution	201
	II. "Amsterdam's" Leadership	202
	1. The Washington Conference of 1919	203
	2. The Hungarian Boycott	205
	3. The Polish Embargo	207
	III. Shades of the Second International	209
	IV. The "Bolshevist Era"	211
	V. The Turn of the Tide	218

CHAPTER	PAGE
X. RETREAT AND CONFUSION, 1921-1923 . . .	221
I. The Two-and-a-Half International . . .	223
II. Defense and Attack	225
1. The "Nep" in Russia	225
2. The "March Putsch" and "Black Friday"	226
3. "To the Masses!"	228
4. The R. I. L. U.	229
5. "Amsterdam" and Reparations . . .	231
III. United Fronts	234
1. The Meeting at Berlin	236
2. Communist "Wings"	240
3. Communists, Syndicalists and Socialists	242
4. "Amsterdam" and the Russian Unions . . .	245
IV. The "Second Wave of Revolution" . . .	246
1. In the Ruhr	246
2. In the Balkans	249
3. The Hamburg Uprising and the "October Retreat"	250
XI. WASHINGTON, AMSTERDAM, AND MOSCOW, 1919-1924	253
I. American Misgivings	254
II. Radicalism at Home and Abroad . . .	255
III. The Montreal Convention	259
IV. The Breach	263
V. A Note of Reconciliation	270
XII. PAN-AMERICAN LABOR, 1918-1924	275
I. Paving the Way	275
1. Cuba and Porto Rico	276
2. Mexico	277
3. South America	280
4. Labor versus "Wall Street"	281
II. Civil War and World War	282
1. Carranza and the Casa del Obrero . .	282
2. The A. F. of L. and the C. R. O. M. .	285

CONTENTS

xv

CHAPTER

PAGE

III.	The Foundations	288
	1. The Laredo Conference	288
	2. Facing the Storm	291
	3. Politics and Migration	294
	4. Imperialism and Trade Unionism	296
IV.	Gompers' Last Public Act	297
	1. A "Labor Monroe Doctrine"	298
	2. The American-Mexican Labor Alliance	300

PART IV. STABILIZATION AND REORGANIZATION, 1924-1928

XIII.	MOODS OF TRANSITION, 1924-1926	305
	I. New British Orientations	307
	II. Communist Preparedness and Bolshe- vization	310
	III. The Anglo-Russian Committee	313
	IV. Zigzags and Oscillations	315
	V. Unity, Unity, there is no Unity!	322
	VI. The British Strikes of 1926	324
	VII. The Price of Failure	334
XIV.	INTERNAL CRISIS, 1926-1927	339
	I. Trotsky and Zinoviev versus Stalin and Bukharin	339
	1. First Encounter—1926	339
	a. The "Opposition Bloc"	339
	b. The Economics of NEP.	341
	c. Is Russia building Socialism?	346
	d. Defeat of the "Opposition"	350
	2. Main Battle—1927	353
	a. The Chinese Dragon and the Brit- ish Lion	353
	b. The Gosplan and the "Opposi- tion" Program	358
	c. The Rout	361
	II. A Conflict of Capitals	363
	1. "Amsterdam's" Affairs	363

CHAPTER	PAGE
2. Sensations of Paris	365
3. Berlin versus London	367
III. American Drifts	369
IV. Pan-American Strains	373
XV. ADJUSTMENTS AND REALIGNMENTS	380

BOOK II—THE OUTLOOK

XVI. THE COURSE OF "AMSTERDAM"	389
I. Outlook and Policy	395
II. Methods of Work	398
III. Organization and Discipline	401
IV. Hurdles in the Path	404
V. Personalities and Leadership	410
VI. Powers of Expansion	414
XVII. "AMSTERDAM'S" SOCIALIST ALLIES	417
I. Socialist Progressivism	418
II. Austro-Marxism	424
III. Socialism in Our Time	429
IV. Socialists and the League of Nations	433
V. Authority and Influence	435
VI. Pulls and Strains	438
VII. The Nature of the Alliance	442
VIII. The Youth Internationals	444
XVIII. THE PLACE OF THE TRADE SECRETARIATS	448
I. Structure and Membership	449
II. Committees and Secretaries	454
III. Theories and Assumptions	457
IV. Devices and Methods	461
1. Transfers and Benefits	462
2. Rates and Standards	465
3. Offense and Defense	467
V. The Secretariats as Going Concerns	470
VI. Problems of Growth	472
1. Wider Fields	472
2. Personnel and Technique	474
3. Secretariats or National Centers	476

CONTENTS

xvii

CHAPTER	PAGE
XIX. AMSTERDAM AND GENEVA	478
I. How the I. L. O. Works	478
1. The Annual Conference	479
2. The Labor Office	483
3. The Governing Body	486
4. The I. L. O. and the League	486
II. Activities and Outlook	489
III. Through "Amsterdam's" Eyes	492
XX. THE CHALLENGE OF COMMUNISM	498
I. Marx and Lenin	499
II. Communist Ideals	500
III. The Dictatorship of the Proletariat	502
IV. The Dynamics of Imperialism	507
V. The Epoch of World Revolution	512
VI. The Communist Task	515
XXI. THE THIRD INTERNATIONAL AND ITS SATELLITES	517
I. Communist Politics	517
1. Cells and Centralism	518
2. E. C. C. I. and Praesidium	520
3. Sections and World Party	524
4. Discipline and Finances	527
II. Communist Trade Unionism	529
1. The R. I. L. U. or Profintern	530
2. Strike Strategy	533
3. Nuclei and Dual Unions	535
4. Claims and Computations	536
III. Auxiliaries	537
1. Farmers and Women	537
2. The Youth	540
3. Red Aid	543
IV. Achilles' Heel	544
1. Human, all too Human	544
2. Capturing and Holding	546
3. "Orders from Moscow"	548
4. Monolith and Factions	551
V. To Be or Not to Be	553

CHAPTER	PAGE
XXII. THE ANARCHO-SYNDICALISTS	559
I. The Syndicalist Viewpoint	561
1. Monopoly and Authority	562
2. Freedom and Equality	563
3. Regionalism and Federalism	566
4. The "World General Strike"	566
5. The Six-Hour Day	568
II. Direct Action	568
III. The I. W. M. A.	571
XXIII. THE VOICE OF THE CHRISTIANS	578
I. Christian Principles	579
1. Man's Destiny	580
2. The Failure of Individualism	580
3. The Errors of Socialism	581
4. The Christian "House on Earth"	582
5. Trade, Class, State, and Church	584
II. Capital and Labor	586
III. Christian Trade Unionism	590
IV. International Activities	595
XXIV. HORIZONS AHEAD	602
APPENDIX TABLES	619
BIBLIOGRAPHICAL NOTES	625
DRAMATIS PERSONÆ	647
INDEX	674

LABOR AND INTERNATIONALISM

LABOR AND INTERNATIONALISM

INTRODUCTION

Internationalism may be an ideal, a policy, or a method. In any case, its characteristic feature is emphasis on the common interests of nations, on the political and economic interdependence of all peoples, on good-will and co-operation as opposed to wars and national conflicts.

During the past one hundred years there have been five types of internationalism: humanitarian, pacifist, commercial, social-reformist, and social-revolutionary. Humanitarian internationalism is an aspiration for common ideas and ideals which would bring the peoples of the world together in a common civilization. Pacifist internationalism is an effort to promote peace through legal methods such as compulsory arbitration and international courts of justice. Commercial internationalism assumes that free trade is the principle which can organize world relations on the basis of a community of interests and of maximum prosperity. Social-reformist internationalism urges international co-operation for the purpose of elevating the social condition of the masses as a necessary foundation of

peaceful relations between nations. Social-revolutionary internationalism advocates a violent social reorganization on a world scale as the *sine qua non* for the establishment of peace, freedom, and equality.

Since 1830, these types of internationalism have resulted in the development of a variety of international institutions. The international associations of a cultural character may be cited as the achievement in the field of humanitarian internationalism. The development of the peace movement in various countries, the creation of the Hague Conference and of the Hague Tribunal before the war, and of the League of Nations since, may be registered as successes in the field of pacifist internationalism.

Commercial or economic internationalism has been less even; has followed a more zigzag course; and has fewer definite results to its credit.

The most persistent developments are to be recorded in the field of social-reformist and social-revolutionary internationalism. These two varieties of internationalism have given rise to elaborate systems of ideas, to numerous economic and political organizations, and to mass movements which have had important bearings on world events.

In the promotion of the first three types of internationalism, various groups of people have played an important part. But social-reformist and social-revolutionary internationalism became connected, from their early days, with organized labor and with

the labor movement. To some extent, labor became interested in internationalism in response to appeals of "intellectuals" and of "social prophets." But to no less an extent, social internationalism—reformist and revolutionary—was a product of labor's own internal growth. Starting with local clubs and societies, labor found itself before long not only evolving organizations national in scope, but reaching out beyond national frontiers, establishing extra-national contacts and developing a system of relations which form the sphere of what is here called the international labor movement.

Six factors have promoted the development of international contacts in the labor movement. One was mass-migration. A second was competition in world markets. Third was the desire of workers in different countries to help one another in economic conflicts. Fourth was the democratic ideal and the desire to promote the independence of small nationalities against the encroachments of large states. Fifth was the question of war and peace, and sixth the socialist ideal of the emancipation of labor.

Stimulated by these factors, labor conceived internationalism partly as a method and partly as a program. As a method, it meant that organized workers in different countries might be able to obtain their particular national objectives by means of internationally co-ordinated action. Labor presumably could use internationalism to increase its powers of trade union action in separate countries; to fix

the rules of world competition to its advantage; to enlarge its share in world politics; or to accelerate in different countries the process of social reorganization. As a program, internationalism meant a social ideal which was thought of as growing out of the conditions of working class life, and which labor was called upon to put into effect.

While regarding its international program and methods as of special importance to itself, labor assumed that in pursuing them, it also served the cause of mankind. In fact, the international labor movement started with two assumptions. One was that labor is a distinct economic and social group which cannot entrust the solution of international problems to the motives which guide and direct official diplomacy. The other was that labor, as a group, is the standard bearer of all human progress and that the success of its program means the coming of a new and higher civilization. On the basis of both assumptions, it was essential that labor should gain a position of influence not only nationally, but internationally, and to that end, it had to build up its own international organizations.

The various purposes which the internationalism of labor sets itself bear directly or indirectly upon the life of nations. International action in industrial disputes may upset the balance of power between labor and capital in any one country at any particular moment or over a long period of time. International trade union action may prolong or stimulate

strikes because of the aid which it offers to strikers. International policies of labor involve an upsetting of economic relationships which otherwise would be determined by national conditions alone. Internationalism also imposes duties and obligations which may conflict with national creeds and loyalties. Last, but not least, internationalism carries a challenge to existing social forms, a challenge which no one can ignore as long as the future of modern institutions is uncertain.

There is, thus, sufficient reason for an examination of the relation between labor and internationalism. How did the idea of a world union of workers originate? What activities, organizations, and institutions has this idea given rise to, and what influence have they had? What has been the record of labor's efforts to realize its international ideas? What is the promise or menace which the international labor movement holds for the world, and how is it to be regarded from a large social point of view?

With these questions this volume is concerned. Book One traces the historical record of the international labor organizations which have risen and fallen during the last one hundred years. Book Two gives an account of the organizations in existence to-day, and analyzes their programs, methods, and outlook. Throughout, the emphasis is not so much on facts, as on their meaning, and on factors and processes which reveal the possibilities and limits of a workers' internationalism.

BOOK ONE
THE STORY

PART I

THE TRADITION, 1830-1880

CHAPTER I

THE TEEMING MASS OF IDEAS, 1830-1848

I. ANTICIPATIONS

A vague idea of a common bond between the laboring people of different countries emerged in Western Europe and America between 1830 and 1840. It was part of the "teeming mass of ideas" which, starting half a century before with the political revolutions in France and America and with the Industrial Revolution in England, were now shaping themselves into currents of thought which were to become characteristic of the nineteenth century.

One of these currents of thought flowed more immediately from the political situation of the third decade of the century. When the Holy Alliance became a "clearing house of obscurantist diplomacy" and Metternich's interventions in Naples, Piedmont, Germany, and Spain revealed the "solidarity of international conservatism," the liberals and democrats of those countries joined hands for common action. From 1822 to 1830, the secret societies of the Carbonari—the Charcoal Burners—in Italy, Spain, and France maintained contacts. During the revolutions in France and Belgium in 1830-31, the political radicals of England arranged

public meetings and collected funds for the "French and Belgian revolutionaries." Though there was little, if any, conscious co-ordination in the uprisings of 1830-31 in France, Belgium, Germany, Italy, and Poland, the widespread character of these outbreaks crystallized the idea that liberalism and democracy in all countries represented a common cause.

After 1830, the tradition of the Carbonari passed to the nationalists of Italy, Poland, and Germany. Mazzini, who had begun his political career as a member of the Carbonari and who broke away in 1831 to form "Young Italy," later took the initiative in forming the organization of "Young Europe" which for a while "loomed large in the public eye." In Mazzini's mind, the idea of nationality was combined with a vague and mystic ideal of international solidarity. He and his fellow enthusiasts gave an international stamp to the nationalistic movements of the day, stressing the political and cultural value of all nations, large and small, and the need of concerted international action for the freedom of all nations.

Concurrently with these ideas, there came to the fore the social cosmopolitanism which between 1830 and 1832 was christened by the name of socialism and which was connected with the work of Robert Owen, Thomas Hodgskin, John Gray, and William Thompson in England, and of St-Simon, Fourier, Buchez, and Pierre Leroux in France. Though starting from different premises and reaching out towards

different practical proposals, these men were at one in their opposition to the new industrial system that had been growing up in Western Europe and America since the middle of the eighteenth century. They condemned its alleged planlessness and ruthlessness, its pecuniary outlook and competitive individualism, and in one form or another, called for a social reorganization on the basis of associative effort and of economic co-operation. In thought as well as in action, these men ignored political boundaries and national differences, appealing to "humanity" for the reform of "society."

In the minds of the skilled artisans and workers who, between 1825 and 1832, began forming the first large labor organizations of modern times, these ideas became combined with a feeling of class status. To a marked degree in England and in a considerable measure in the United States and France, groups of workers began to think of themselves not as weavers, or carpenters, or tailors, or miners, but as members of a great class which in all countries was "being pushed deeper and deeper into the mire by the power of capital and the power of the law."

From the meeting of these currents of thought and feeling sprang the first anticipations of a specific workers' internationalism. One of its earliest expressions is found in an article in the "Free Enquirer" published in New York, dated November 27, 1830. The writer of the article, the famous Frances Wright, had seen the "mechanics" and

skilled workers of the seaboard cities of America form the first central labor unions and the first political labor parties in the world for the purpose of gaining more leisure and more education and of raising "the mechanical and productive classes to that condition of true independence and equality" which would be in accord with the principles of justice and with the Declaration of Independence. On her return to Europe, she witnessed the "glorious days of July" in France. Aroused by these events, Frances Wright wrote: "What distinguishes the present from every other struggle in which the human race has been engaged, is that the present is evidently, openly and acknowledgedly a war of class and that this war is universal. . . . It is now everywhere the oppressed millions who are making common cause against oppression. . . ." ¹

In similar vein was the declaration of the National Union of the Working Classes of England made in an address to the people of Ireland on August 17, 1831. The National Union was a "confused medley" of socialism, trade unionism, and of the political radicalism of William Cobbett, that "extraordinary Englishman of his times" who hated the rising power of the "Seigneurs of the Twist," the "Sovereigns of of the Spinning Jenny," and of the "Lords of the Loom." ² "We hope the day is not distant," wrote

¹ Quoted in Commons, John R., and others, *A Documentary History of American Industrial Society*, Vol. 5, p. 178.

² Cole, G. D. H., *The Life of William Cobbett*, p. 256.

the leaders of the National Union, "when the oppressed poor of every country will unite in sentiment and action for the benefit of the whole human race."³

Three years later, a note in the same key rang out in France. By 1834, the first modern movement of labor unrest which began with the crisis of 1825-6 and which was to collapse with the panic of 1837, had reached its peak in America, England, and France. In the United States it resulted in the formation of the National Trades' Union; in England it produced the Grand National Consolidated Trades Union whose object was to place all industry and capital in the hands of the workers and whose "gigantic enlistments" ran into half a million in a few months; in France it gave rise to secret revolutionary and socialist societies. In the secret societies of Paris which propagated the faith⁴ in "a final emancipation of the proletariat," the French workers were brought into contact with the tradition of the

³ Shadwell, Arthur, *The Socialist Movement*, Part I, p. 134.

⁴ The germ of this idea is contained in Baboeuf's "Manifesto of the Equals." Baboeuf was a communist and in his "Manifesto" made the prophecy that "the French Revolution is but the precursor of another revolution far greater, far more solemn, which will be the last." This idea was carried over into the secret societies of France after 1830 by Buonarotti, an old Italian conspirator who had taken part in the conspiracy of Baboeuf in 1796 and who wrote an account of it in his old age. His didactic book *L'Histoire de la Conspiration pour l'Egalité* became the bible of the "revolutionary communists" who called themselves "Babouvists" and who declared that it was "the mission of the nineteenth century to emancipate la belle classe des prolétaires."

Carbonari and with the followers of Mazzini. Under the influence of their ideas and of the stir made by the Grand National Consolidated Trades Union of England, the workers of Nantes wrote to the workers of London in June, 1834: "Brothers and Friends! Do not let our Union be stopped by the seas or rivers that mark the boundaries of States. Let us put into communication London, Paris, Manchester, Lyons, Liverpool, Nantes, Bordeaux, Oporto, Lisbon, Cadiz, Barcelona, Turin, and all the great centers of industry in the world."⁵

II. LOVETT AND BLANQUI

What may be termed the first incident of the international labor movement occurred two years later. It was occasioned by an "International Address" of the London Working Men's Association⁶ to the "Working Classes of Belgium" in protest against the imprisonment of a Brussels worker named Jacob Katz, who had called together a public meeting of "his fellow laborers to talk over their grievances." The "Address" was replied to by an "Address from the Working Men of Belgium" signed by committees of workers in Brussels, Ghent, and Liege. Both the address of the London Working Men's Association and the reply were published in the radical periodicals of France and elicited much comment.

The author of the "Address to the Working Classes

⁵ Postgate, R. W., *The Workers' International*, p. 13.

⁶ The London Working Men's Association was organized in June, 1836, and became the center of the Chartist movement.

of Belgium" was William Lovett, secretary and prime mover of the London Working Men's Association, who may be called the first working man of modern times with an international outlook. Lovett came by it through a process of personal development in which the various influences of the day were combined. As a journeyman cabinet-maker, Lovett had had his share in the fight against the Anti-Combination laws and his baptism in trade unionism. As a member of the liberal and radical circles of London he had accepted the idea that universal suffrage and political organization were necessary to carry out economic and social reforms. From Robert Owen he had received his faith in the coming of "a new moral order" and of a co-operative economic system. As a member of the National Union of the Working Classes in 1831-33 and of the Grand National Consolidated Trades Union in 1834, he became convinced that it was necessary for the workers to develop their own leadership from within their own ranks. As one who had with great effort lifted himself above the level of illiteracy to which his class was doomed in the days when universal and compulsory education was unknown, he was intensely interested in popular education and denounced "the hawks and owls of society seeking to perpetuate the state of mental darkness."⁷ As a leader in the labor circles of London, he came in

⁷ *The Life and Struggles of William Lovett in his Pursuit of Bread, Knowledge, and Freedom*, edit. of 1920, Vol. I, p. 27.

contact with the political exiles from Italy, Germany, France, Poland, and other countries, and through them caught a glimpse of the international politics of the times.

Lovett's "International Addresses" called forth a "great number of addresses and communications from different bodies" and in reply to these Lovett published in 1838 an "Address to the Working Classes of Europe" in which he suggested the idea of an international labor organization. "Fellow producers of wealth!" he wrote. "Seeing that our oppressors are united, . . . why should not we unite in holy zeal to show the injustice of war, the cruelty of despotism, and the misery it entails upon our species?"⁸

While Lovett was developing these ideas in England, the first contacts between workers of different countries were made in the secret societies of France. There was a succession of such societies in Paris, the "Société des Droits de l'Homme" giving way in 1834 to the "Société des Familles" which in 1836 was succeeded by the "Société des Saisons." The dominating influence in these societies was Auguste Blanqui, who had entered political life during the revolution of 1830, while studying law in Paris, and who from that time on had devoted himself to political conspiracies. Blanqui was a follower of Baboeuf, and laid stress on the idea that social reforms could be carried out only by an uprising and by the estab-

⁸ *Ibid.*, pp. 154-162.

lishment of a revolutionary dictatorship. A number of German workers living in Paris organized the "Federation of the Just" which affiliated with the "Société des Saisons."^a

By the end of the decade, there were thus in France and in England small groups of socialists, Chartists, Owenites, "revolutionary democrats," and communists who were harboring the project of an "international association for the emancipation of the working classes." A conference for the purpose was planned in 1839, in London. But the agitation in England for the presentation of the "People's Charter" and for a general strike which resulted in the arrest of Lovett and of other Chartists, and the unsuccessful uprising of Blanqui in Paris on May 12, 1839, made such a conference impossible.

III. THE "HOT AIR" FORTIES

After 1840, the idea of internationalism found a new stimulus in the intellectual and social ferment which became the characteristic feature of the forties. In all Western countries, men's minds were perturbed by the widespread distress which began with the panic of 1837 and which continued with short intervals throughout the "hungry forties." To many thoughtful men and women it seemed impossible that an industrial system marked by great contrasts of wealth and poverty and subject

^a Wilhelm Weitling, the famous German communist tailor, was a member of the "Federation of the Just."

to frequent panics and crises should be able to survive, and in the hopeful and rationalistic spirit of the day, hosts of reformers and philanthropists put forth a variety of plans, schemes, utopias, and prescriptions for the "reorganization of society" and for the saving of humanity.¹⁰

One of the first results of this philanthropic impulse was the resurgence of the idea, first expressed by Robert Owen in 1818, that the condition of the industrial workers in any one country could be permanently improved only by the international co-operation of governments. In 1839, such a suggestion had been again made by Villermé, whose book on conditions in the textile industries of France caused a sensation. After 1840, this idea was elaborated by Daniel Le Grand, an Alsatian manufacturer, in the form of a program of international labor legislation.

At the same time, the growing uneasiness in the international situation as manifested in the diplomatic tangle in the Near East in 1840, in the tension between England and France in 1844, and in the Oregon issue between England and the United States in 1846 called forth the first popular peace

¹⁰ There are few significant names in the world of Western letters and thought during these years that are not to be found in one or another of the reform movements of the times. The "bizarre junction" of ideas amused later generations and resulted in the characterization of the decade as the "loquacious forties," the "garrulous forties," and the "hot air" period. It should be remembered, however, that these years were also a period of large political and social syntheses.

movement of modern times. Before 1840, the American Peace Society had begun an agitation for a Congress of Nations in order to establish an international tribunal. With the publication of William Ladd's pamphlet on a "Congress of Nations" in 1840, the movement gained momentum, and in 1843 there was held in London the first international peace congress, at which some three hundred delegates were present.

In contact with this pacifist internationalism, there also developed during these years the doctrine of commercial internationalism, based upon the idea of Free Trade, which Richard Cobden preached with almost religious fervor. Richard Cobden, admired by some as the "first international man," ridiculed by others as the "inspired bagman who believed in a cotton millennium," was primarily influenced in his thinking by the first world-industry of modern times—the cotton industry, and voiced the new sense of a growing community of interests between the countries of the world which was stimulated by the coming of the railway, by increasing facilities of communication, by the extension of machine industry into new countries, by the rapid expansion of foreign trade, and by the opening up of international financial relations. Addressing the advocates of peace in 1842 he wrote: "The efforts of the Peace Societies, however laudable, can never be successful as long as the nations maintain their present system of isolation. The Colonial System, with all its daz-

zling appeals to the passions of the people, can never be got rid of except by the indirect processes of Free Trade. . . . Yet the Colonial System of Europe has been the chief source of war for the last hundred and fifty years." And in 1846 he wrote: "I see in the free trade principle that which shall act on the moral world as the principle of gravitation in the Universe—drawing men together, thrusting aside the antagonism of race and creed and language, and uniting us in the bonds of peace."

In this environment of ideas and movements, the advocates of "an international organization for the emancipation of the working classes" tended to draw nearer together. With the increased facilities for travel, they came more frequently into personal contact. Paris and London were the centers where socialists, Owenites, Chartists, co-operators, "democrats," communists, revolutionists,¹¹ and nationalists met and planned and schemed. In Paris especially, between 1843 and 1846, one could have found at one time or another that group of men who exercised a profound influence on the social thought of the century. It was a cosmopolitan and revolutionary atmosphere, surcharged with the hopes and dreams of the political refugees from Eastern, Southern, and Central Europe. The Russian, Michel Bakunin, who arrived in Paris in 1844, after being expelled

¹¹ For the programs of these schools of social thought between 1840 and 1848 see Laidler, Harry W., *A History of Socialist Thought*, 1927.

from Germany; described it as follows: "We became firmly convinced that we were living during the last days of a dying civilization. . . . Two months on the boulevards of Paris was enough to turn a liberal into a socialist."¹²

IV. FROM FLORA TRISTAN TO KARL MARX

From 1843 on, there is steady advance in the thought of these "intellectuals" and workers and in their efforts to bring about a practical organization. In 1843, there appeared in France a booklet entitled "L'Union Ouvrière" in which the first concrete plan for an international labor organization was presented. The author, Flora Tristan, who had been impressed by the Chartist movement in England, urged the workers of France to "form themselves into a class," as the bourgeoisie had done in 1789 and in 1830, and to unite without regard to sex, politics, religion, or national boundaries in order to obtain a share in political and economic power. "The Workers' Union," she wrote, "should establish in the principal cities of England, Germany, Italy, in a word, in all the capitals of Europe, committees of correspondence." Flora Tristan's booklet went through three editions and sold over 20 thousand copies.

About the same time, the Workers' Educational Society of London, known also as the "Group of

¹² Compère-Morel, *Encyclopédie Socialiste Syndicale et Coopérative*, p. 299.

Communist Education,"¹³ began negotiations with Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels, then in Paris, to form a communist federation. Marx and Engels refused. But in 1845, the London "Group" was again in communication with Marx, who was then in Brussels, where he had gathered about him some German followers.

As the events of 1846-7 unfolded, the efforts of these groups in Paris, London, and Brussels to get together became more persistent. On March 3, 1846, the Chartists in London held a large public meeting to protest against the danger of war between England and the United States and sent an address to the workers of America to take similar action.¹⁴ In May, the Chartists held another meeting in London to protest against the suppression of the Polish uprising in Cracow. In July of the same year, Marx and Engels, in the name of the German Democratic Communists of Brussels, were in communication with Feargus O'Connor, the leader of Chartism. And before the end of the year, a "Central European Committee" had been set up with local "correspondence committees" in Paris and London.

As the "European Committee" did not function,

¹³ Its founders were German members of the "Federation of the Just" who had escaped from Paris to London after Blanqui's uprising; its membership included a few political exiles from Scandinavia, Holland, and Hungary.

¹⁴ Schlüter, Hermann, *Die Anfänge der Deutschen Arbeiterbewegung in Amerika*, p. 42.

a conference was called in London in the summer of 1847 to attempt a more effective union. Only a few German delegates attended, and they organized themselves into a "Communist League" for the "overthrow of the bourgeoisie." A second conference was held in November, 1847, which again turned out to be a gathering of German refugees from Paris, Brussels, and London. But the gathering assumed significance from the fact that Marx and Engels appeared before it and read to it their declaration of program which was later elaborated into the "Communist Manifesto."

In the "Communist Manifesto," a small pamphlet of some 40 pages, the two authors,¹⁵ both of them young men under 30, brought together into a closely knit synthesis the speculations of the French socialists, the ideas of the English economists, the political reasoning of Chartism, the revolutionary tactics of Blanquism with the methodology of Hegelian dialectics. Most of the ideas in the "Manifesto" had been common currency in socialist and revolutionary circles for nearly a decade. It was commonly held that the development of "capitalism" was condemning the workers to increasing misery, that the concentration of industry was eliminating the middle classes and bringing capitalists and proletarians into sharper conflicts, and that capitalist economy was subject to periodic crises and would finally end in a

¹⁵ The "Communist Manifesto" was the work of both Engels and Marx, but it was written, in its final form, by Marx alone.

social cataclysm which would be the beginning of a social transformation. The originality of Marx and Engels consisted in seeing these different trends as the manifestations of a single process of the struggle of classes whose driving power lay in changes of technique and whose ultimate social results—the forcible abolition of private property and the establishment of a communist society—could be brought about only by the workers themselves organized into a separate political party for the purpose of winning political power and of using such power to carry out measures of social reform.

Marx and Engels claimed that the struggle of the workers was international in essence. National differences, they wrote, were being wiped out by the development of free trade, by the growth of a world market, and by the increasing uniformity of industrial and social conditions. The workers in particular were being “denationalized” by modern industry, and had no fatherland. None the less, the workers’ movement was national in form in the sense that the workers of each country had to “square accounts” with their own bourgeoisie. Also, since the working class in each country had to gain political power, it had to act as “a national class,” which meant that it had to elevate itself to the position of “being the nation.” In this mixed sense of cosmopolitanism and nationalism, Marx and Engels declared that the combined action of the workers in “at least the civilized countries” was necessary for

a successful "communist revolution" and wound up their "manifesto" with the passionate appeal—"Workers of all Lands, Unite!"

The "Communist Manifesto" had only a passing reference to trade unions. After the first trade union movement of the thirties went under in the panic of 1837, craft and trade unions formed anew in all Western countries, but on a more modest scale, and they kept aloof from the social movements of the day. The larger "labor movement" of these years was centered in the political, educational, co-operative, and revolutionary organizations in which an *élite* of skilled workers and small groups of middle-class "intellectuals" combined to reorganize the entire social life of the world.

Among the organizations of the day, the Chartists of England were by far the most important. As Marx and Engels expected the impending "bourgeois revolution" in Germany to be "the immediate prelude to a proletarian revolution," they were eager to bring about a union between the Chartists, the Continental "democrats," and their own "Communist League." In November, 1847, they attempted this at a meeting held in London to celebrate the anniversary of the Polish insurrection of 1830. After a resolution of sympathy with Poland was passed, "Dr. Charles Marx" was introduced to the meeting as vice-president of the Brussels Democratic Society. In a speech delivered in German, Marx attacked the "one-sided fraternity of the free trad-

ers," and urged the calling of a "congress of working men to establish liberty all over the world."

This congress was to be held in Brussels on September 25, 1848. However, within a few months after the London meeting, the French Revolution of 1848 broke out. Before the date set for the "first congress of working men," the revolutionary wave had swept all Central and Southern Europe, had set into motion democratic currents in England, and had caused some disturbance as far as the United States in the West and Russia in the East. Following upon the world depression of 1847, the revolutions of 1848 were a vivid demonstration of the growing unity of world history. But the democratic and revolutionary internationalists were overwhelmed by the rapid course of events, and their efforts to promote international action merely dramatized the fact that only the mere beginnings of the idea of such action were as yet in existence.

CHAPTER II

THE FIRST INTERNATIONAL, 1864-1876

I. FRENCH TRADITIONS AND BRITISH REALISM

As the waves of revolution receded in 1848-50, they carried in their backward sweep the very memory of the "hungry" and "turbulent" forties. With the discovery of gold in California and Australia, with the opening up of new lands beyond the Mississippi, with the great changes in the iron trades and in the technique of agriculture, with the rapid extension of railway and ocean transportation, a "new era of economic expansion" set in which was soon to bring unexampled opportunities for the making of individual fortunes and for improving the condition of the masses. In Western Europe, the skilled workers benefited by this expansion, by the large migrations to the United States and to Australia which relieved the pressure of population, by the fall in the cost of food, and by the new labor laws which smoothed out some of the rougher edges of the earlier industrialism.

This economic prosperity was accompanied by a general intellectual reaction. In contrast to the "hot air" forties, the decade of the fifties was marked by "political inertia" and by a practical and realistic

spirit. The "social problem" lost its hold on men's minds, and the center of interest shifted to problems of national expansion and of international rivalry. In France and Germany, the working men's societies which had been built during the years of upheaval, vanished or were suppressed by the government. In England, Chartism died out and was quickly forgotten. The "Communist League" was dissolved in 1852. The intellectuals who had played a large part in the events of 1848 dropped out of public life.

Among the workers, this was a period of the building up of "tough and unromantic" organizations for the gaining of a larger share in the prosperity of the day. In France and Germany, where the workers were hindered by political reaction and by legal disabilities, their efforts were confined to self-education and mutual aid. But in England and in the United States, these were years of the formation of the first large craft unions of modern times. In England especially, this new development was important.¹ Here there grew up in the course of the fifties not only numerous trade clubs and societies in single crafts in a town or district, but also the first national craft unions, such as the Amalgamated Society of Engineers, the Society of Carpenters, and the Society of Ironfounders, which by means of high dues, by out-of-work, traveling, sickness, and other benefits,

¹ In the United States, the craft unions which were formed between 1849 and 1855 were wiped out in the panic of 1857, and those that were organized in 1859-60 disappeared during the first year of the Civil War.

by close attention to trade matters and by the centralization of power, laid the foundations of a stable trade unionism which was to serve for a long time as a model not only in England, but in other countries as well.

It was among the leaders of the British trade unions that the idea of an international labor organization now appeared. It came to them as a result of the influx of workers from Germany, France, and Belgium into the trades of London after 1850, but gained impetus only after the crisis of 1857-8. One of the effects of that crisis was the collapse of the building boom of the previous years and a strike of the workers in the building trades of London against a cut in wages and a lengthening of working hours. The building contractors met the strike with a lock-out and with attempts to import strike-breakers from the Continent. The trade unions of London then organized the London Trades' Council, in the summer of 1860, to promote their common interests. From this experience the labor leaders of the London Trades' Council—Robert Applegarth, W. R. Cremer, George Howell, and George Odger—especially the latter, drew the lesson that it was desirable and necessary for the workers of England to establish ties with those of the Continent. This conclusion was confirmed in their minds as a result of a second strike in the building trades of London in March, 1861.

While British labor leaders were turning their

attention to the Continent, events there were beginning to arouse in some labor circles an interest in international affairs. With the liberal change in the policy of Napoleon the Third, which was in part a result of the crisis of 1857-8, and with the war against Austria for the liberation of Italy in 1859, came that turn in events which was to make the decade of the sixties the high water mark of individualist and nationalist liberalism. Between 1859 and the middle of 1861 the first Italian Parliament had met in Turin, Russia had abolished serfdom and had inaugurated the era of great reforms, the United States had entered upon the Civil War, and Germany had witnessed the reawakening of demands for liberal reform. Under the stimulus of these events, the workers of the Continent were brought into contact with the workers of England in the course of which they revived the idea of international organization, in accordance with the traditions of 1848.

II. ST. MARTIN'S HALL

Contacts between the British and Continental workers were at first casual. On December 17, 1861, the London Trades' Council received a request from the General Society of Working Men of Naples for aid in securing Italian unity and in organizing trade unions. The London Trades' Council prepared an account of the English trade unions which was circulated on the Continent.

In the summer of 1862, over 300 workmen from

France and about a dozen from Germany came to the International Exhibition in London. They were entertained by the London trade unionists and came in contact also with the political refugees from their own countries living in London. During these meetings, the idea of an international labor association seems to have been discussed.

In the further course of the year, communications were established between committees of workers which were organized in London and Paris to help the workers in the cotton trades of England and France who were out of work as a result of the industrial dislocations caused by the Civil War in America. By the beginning of 1863, the workers of England, in alliance with John Bright, were carrying on an intense campaign for the prevention of war between their country and the United States, which strengthened their growing sense of the economic and political interdependence of the world.

Negotiations between French workers and the leaders of the London trade unions were carried a step further in 1863 as a result of the Polish insurrection. In Paris and London, committees to help the Polish insurgents were organized by workers, and on July 22, 1863, these committees arranged an "International Meeting" in London, at which Odger and Cremer, in the name of the English workers, and Henri Tolain, Perrochon, and Limousin for the workers of Paris, demanded the restoration of Polish independence. The following day the leaders of the

London Trades' Council arranged a private gathering at which they took up with the French workers the question of an international labor organization. It was decided that the English labor leaders should prepare an address on the subject to the French workers.

About four months later, such an address "to the working men of France from the working men of England," written by George Odger, was dispatched to Paris. Its main theme was the need of international labor action. "We find," read the "Address," "that whenever we attempt to better our social condition by reducing the hours of toil, or by raising the price of labor, our employers threaten us with bringing over Frenchmen, Germans, Belgians, and others to do our work at a reduced rate of wages, and we are sorry to say that this has been done, though not from any desire on the part of our Continental brethren to injure us, but through a want of regular and systematic communication between the industrial classes of all countries. Our aim is to bring up the wages of the ill-paid to as near a level as possible with that of those who are better remunerated, and not to allow our employers to play us all one against the other, and to drag us down to the lowest possible condition, suitable to their avaricious bargaining." ²

² Quoted in Riasanov, D., *Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels*, p. 145. This "Address" was translated into French by Professor Edward Spencer Beesley.

The French workers did not compose their reply until almost a year later. When it was ready, the same three workers who had attended the meeting in July, 1863, went to London to present it.

To receive the French delegation, a meeting was arranged at St. Martin's Hall on September 28, 1864. To give the meeting an international character, the London trade unionists invited refugees from different countries living in London. The meeting was attended by Italian followers of Mazzini, by French socialists and Blanquists, by Polish revolutionists, and by a number of members of the former "Communist League" among whom was Karl Marx, who had been living in London since 1849 pursuing his studies in the British Museum. There were also some surviving Owenites and Chartists. The meeting was crowded, and was presided over by E. S. Beesley, one of the Positivists who were advisers at the time to the British organized workers.

At the meeting, Odger first read the English "Address." Then Tolain read the French reply, the keynote of which was that "capital was concentrating in mighty financial and industrial combinations," and that the workers of the world must seek "salvation through solidarity." After that, the meeting voted in favor of the French project, which provided for an international association with a central committee in London and with branches in all the capitals of Europe. A provisional committee of

twenty-one Englishmen, ten Germans, nine Frenchmen, six Italians, two Poles, and two Swiss, was elected to prepare a program and constitution for the new organization.

III. INAUGURAL AND CONSTITUTION

Among the members of this committee were followers of various social schools, and various plans were advocated by them. On October 11, 1864, Mazzini's secretary, Major L. Wolff, submitted to the General Committee the rules of the Italian Working Men's Association of Naples as a model to be copied by the International Working Men's Association.³ Marx opposed this proposal as this would have made of the International a secret society. Marx had a draft of his own which was approved by the General Committee on November 8, 1864. It was in the form of an "Address to the Working Classes" which became known as the "Inaugural Address."

In preparing the "Inaugural Address," Marx realized that his task was to draft a compromise platform on which the different elements of labor could unite. In the labor world of the day, trade unions were of importance only in England. In these trade unions, an "aristocracy of skilled workmen" was under the guidance of leaders who cared more for results than for theory and who on the whole

³ The name "International Working Men's Association" was adopted by the committee.

accepted the prevailing doctrines of economic individualism and political liberalism. In France, organization was just beginning among the workers in the luxury trades of Paris. While these workers of Paris demanded the right to organize and to strike, they had but little interest in trade unionism of the British type. They pinned their faith to co-operative credit and to productive co-operation, largely under the influence of the ideas of Louis Blanc and of Proudhon. In Germany, Lassalle had just organized the "General Working Men's Association," whose chief demands were for universal suffrage and productive co-operation. In other countries of Europe, there were only small societies and organizations of workers. In the United States, the trade unions in the iron, building, and other skilled trades were primarily interested in protecting themselves against the effects of inflation, of a rapidly growing industrialism, and of immigration. In all countries, the workers' societies were isolated and had not yet risen to a consciousness of common interests even on a national scale.

To draft a statement acceptable to such different groups, Marx put aside the tone and tenor of the "Communist Manifesto." He used words which he himself could only smile at,⁴ and avoided all reference to socialization or other communist views, in

⁴ In a letter to Engels he wrote: "I was compelled to put in the 'Preamble' two phrases about 'duty' and 'right,' also 'truth, justice, and morality' which, however, are so placed that they can do no harm."

order to emphasize such of his ideas as would appeal to all.

As a result, the "Inaugural Address" was written in a low and moderate tone. It quoted statistics to show the great growth of trade and commerce between 1845 and 1864, but claimed that the "intoxicating augmentation of wealth and power was entirely confined to the propertied classes." In all countries of Europe, according to the "Address," it had become clear to every unprejudiced mind that no improvement in machinery, no application of science to industry, no new contrivance of transport, no emigration, no opening of new markets, no free trade, not all those factors put together, could do away with the misery of the productive classes.

Somewhat in contradiction to the above, the "Address" went on to show that the ten-hour day gained in England in 1847 had not only resulted in an improvement of the physical, moral, and intellectual condition of the British workers, but had also been the "victory of a principle." The "Address" also referred to the experiments in co-operative production as a "victory" of the workers, for they proved that the "despised hands" could carry on production without the aid of employers. None the less, in the words of the "Address," the co-operative efforts of the workers were inadequate to curb monopoly and privilege. The workers had to use the agencies of the state to promote their interests,

and the conquest of political power was, therefore, the "first duty of the working class."

What the workers had at their command, as a means to success, was numbers. But numbers could weigh in the balance only if united by combination and led by knowledge. Unless the workers organized in each country and unless the workers of different countries maintained "fraternal ties," their efforts were doomed to failure. Besides, there was yet another reason for the international action of working men. The foreign policy of governments in "pursuit of evil designs" and playing on national prejudices, had taught the workers "the duty to master the mysteries of international politics, to watch the diplomatic acts of their respective governments," and "to counteract them, if necessary, by all means in their power." The "Address" struck its last chord on the appeal: "Workmen of all countries, Unite!"

Marx also wrote the Preamble and the Rules of the International. The Rules defined the purpose of the International as that of a central medium of communication and co-operation between workers' societies in different countries having the same aims, namely, mutual help, progress, and the complete emancipation of the working classes. Membership in the Association was open to local or national workers' societies, known as "sections." Each section was allowed to organize in its own way and to elect a delegate to the annual congress which was to

elect a General Council. The functions of the General Council were to keep members informed of the labor market in all countries, to make studies of labor conditions, to bring the same problems to the attention of working people of different countries, to collect statistics, to publish a bulletin, to promote the national consolidation of labor organizations in each country, to help its members in search of work in foreign countries, and to carry on all the administrative work necessary to achieve these ends. Dues were to be collected by the General Council to pay its expenses.

IV. THE FIRST INTERNATIONAL LABOR CONGRESS

For two years after its organization, the General Council was preoccupied mainly with the question of arranging the first congress of the International. The members of the General Council met in a small room in a working class district of London which served as headquarters. There was friction between the members of the Council, not only on questions of politics, economics, and religion, but also as to the purpose of the organization which they had brought into being. The English trade unionists wanted to use it as a means of spreading trade unions of the British type on the Continent; Mazzini saw in it the germ of a new secret society for the promotion of republicanism in Europe; the Blanquists hoped to turn it to the purposes of insur-

rection; while a few shared with Marx the idea that it was the first step towards a general union of workers in all countries for the purpose of a complete socialist reorganization of society.

Following the precedent of the English labor world, the General Council took occasion to state its views on the political problems of the day by means of "Addresses." One, to President Lincoln on November 29, 1864, congratulated the American people on his re-election and expressed satisfaction that it should have fallen to him, the "noble son of the working class," to lead his country in a civil war which marked the beginning of a new era for labor and social reconstruction.⁵ Charles Francis Adams, then American Ambassador in London, wrote a polite reply. On May 13, 1865, the General Council sent another "Address" to President Johnson expressing deep indignation at the assassination of Lincoln. A third, in September, 1865, congratulated the American people on the successful outcome of the Civil War and on the preservation of the Union.

During 1866, the General Council co-operated with the London Trades' Council in the campaign for suffrage reform which was then absorbing the British workers. However, its main work was the calling of the first international labor congress ever held. This congress met in Geneva from the 3rd to

⁵ Quoted in Schlüter, Hermann, *Die Internationale in Amerika*, p. 43.

the 8th of September, 1866. At this time the International had small "sections" in France, Belgium, Switzerland, and Germany, which consisted of skilled artisans and intellectuals. The largest membership of the International was in England, where some 17 trade unions with an estimated membership of over 25,000 had "adhered." But neither sections nor trade unions paid dues regularly, and the total income for 1865-66 amounted to about \$285. Of the 60 delegates who came to the Geneva congress, the majority were from Switzerland.

The Geneva congress devoted its sessions to a discussion of twelve points. These were: the organization and aim of the International; past, present, and future of trade unions; female and child labor; limitation of the working day; co-operation and trade unions; capital and labor; foreign competition; taxation; international institutions; the necessity of destroying the Russian power and of re-establishing Poland; standing armies; religious ideas; the establishment of a friendly society.

A great diversity of ideas was reflected in these discussions. The English workers, as indicated above, were political and economic liberals. The Swiss workers were led by a Dr. Coullery, a "neo-Christian humanitarian." The Belgians were "Colinists," followers of J. G. C. A. H. Colins, who advocated a mixture of atheism and spiritualism, collective ownership of land and private property in capital. The few German delegates present were followers of Marx who, though not in attendance at

the congress, sent a detailed report for the guidance of his adherents.

As against these, the French workers were followers of Proudhon, or "mutualists," and believed that mutuality or reciprocity of service was the essence of social justice. Their theory was that the product of labor should belong to the producer who should exchange it for products which had cost an equal amount of labor. They were opposed to state intervention in human relations, to strikes, and to trade unions, and believed that the workers could "emancipate" themselves by organizing co-operative societies for production, mutual insurance, consumption, and credit. They had special hopes in "People's Banks" and advocated an organization for international credit.

Because of these disagreements, the work of the Geneva Congress was diffuse. However, it approved the Rules drafted by Marx, and adopted a number of resolutions, the most important of which were those in favor of a maximum eight-hour day, of international protective laws for women and children, and of the abolition of night work for women.⁶

V. YEARS OF GROWTH

In 1867, the International had its first opportunity to be of service to English and French workers. In the spring and summer of that year, the bronze-

⁶ The idea of the international regulation of labor conditions had made some headway between 1852 and 1866, owing to the work of Le Grand in France and of various advocates in Switzerland and Belgium.

workers of Paris were locked out for forming a union, while in London the tailors went on strike for a reduction of hours of work. The General Council collected over 1,000 pounds from English unions for the Paris bronze-workers and helped them to win their strike. Some money was also collected on the Continent for the London tailors, but the chief work of the International in this connection was the effort to prevent the importation of strike-breakers.

As a result of these activities, the membership of the International grew during the year. In England, a trade union congress held in Sheffield recommended that all unions join the International, and some 20 trade unions complied. In France, a number of new unions were formed which adhered to the International. There was an increase also in the membership in Belgium and Switzerland. In America, William H. Sylvis, of the Iron Moulders' Union, an outstanding labor leader of the day, and W. Jessup, of the Machinists' and Blacksmiths' Union, introduced a resolution at the second congress of the National Labor Union in favor of establishing official connections with the International. Sylvis believed that American labor could not raise its own standards as long as the American labor market was easily accessible to cheap European labor. He was worried at the time by the effects of the Act of Congress of 1864, which enabled employers to import laborers under contract and to check off transportation costs from wages. Sylvis thought that through the International, something

could be done to regulate immigration. His resolution was voted down, the congress of the National Labor Union confining itself to an expression of sympathy for and a promise to co-operate with "the organized working men of Europe in their struggle against political and social injustice."

Despite the increase in membership, the finances of the International did not improve. From September, 1866, to September, 1867, the total income was a little over \$230, of which \$68 came from England, \$125 from France, \$38 from Switzerland. Rent could not be paid regularly, and the secretary's salary, which had been fixed by the Geneva congress at about \$250 a year, was in arrears. The members of the General Council tried for a while to raise subscriptions among themselves, but after having raised about \$12 in nine weeks, they abandoned the effort.

During the three years considered, the English trade unionists, though not regular in their attendance, dominated the General Council. George Odger was its president; W. R. Cremer, R. Shaw, and Peter Fox were its successive secretaries from 1864 to the end of 1867. The "Addresses" of the International, though written by Marx, were in accordance with the ideas and methods of the English unions.

At the congresses of the International, however, the French members exercised the greatest influence. Not only at the congress of Geneva in 1866, but also at the congress of Lausanne, from September 2 to September 8, 1867, the workers of Paris presented the most elaborate reports, led in the dis-

cussions, and carried through their resolutions against strikes, for co-operative societies, and in favor of a "People's Bank."

After the congress of Lausanne, the International receded for a while. The interest of the English trade unions slackened, while the Paris sections were destroyed by court prosecutions. But towards the summer of 1868, the International took a sudden leap forward. From that date to the middle of 1870, it gained rapidly in membership and spread to new countries. It profited by the strike movements in different countries which followed the industrial upswing of 1868 and which led to the formation of trade unions everywhere. In France, there was an outburst of strikes and a mushroom growth of trade unions which joined the International; by 1869, the French membership of the International was estimated at 200,000. In Belgium, a series of strikes in 1868 among miners and textile workers, in the course of which the workers were fired on by troops, resulted in the organization of a trade union federation with some 60 branches, which became one of the strongest national sections of the International. In Switzerland, a strike in the building trades of Geneva in 1868, during which the General Council collected funds for the strikers, stirred up much interest in trade unionism and in the International.⁷

⁷ Money for the strikers of Belgium and Switzerland was collected in the United States by the Social Party of New York.

In Italy, Spain, and Portugal, disturbed political conditions and economic misery led to the formation of trade unions and of workers' revolutionary societies. In these three countries, the leading part in the labor movement of these days fell to the Russian, M. Bakunin.⁸ At first, Bakunin organized an international society of his own under the name of the International Alliance of Social Democracy; but in July, 1869, the branches of this Society were admitted to the International. The membership of these new sections grew rapidly, especially in Spain.

In Germany, the workers' societies under the leadership of August Bebel and Wilhelm Liebknecht at a congress in Eisenach in 1869, affiliated with the International. In the United States, the National Labor Union at its Philadelphia convention of 1869 decided to send a delegate to the congress of the International which was to be held in Basel that year, and at its convention in Cincinnati in 1870 not only declared "its adherence to the principles of

⁸ After his emergence from Petro-Pavlovsk prison and exile in Siberia, Bakunin spent his time gathering about him young revolutionists and organizing them into secret societies. In 1864, he organized in Italy the International Brotherhood, whose mission was to preach materialism, popular revolution, and the reorganization of society on the basis of federalism and free communes. From 1866 to 1868, Bakunin was active in the peace movement. But when the League of Peace in Bern in 1868 refused to endorse his socialist ideas, he left the League and founded the "International Alliance of Social Democracy" with a program which included the advocacy of atheism, the abolition of the right of inheritance, common property in the means of production and distribution, and the abolition of the state.

the Working Men's Association" but also its expectation to "join the said association in a short time."

In addition to trade union affiliations, mixed sections of workers and intellectuals were formed during these years in the United States, England, Denmark, Holland, and Austria-Hungary; by 1871, there were 8,000 dues-paying members in mixed sections in England; the Danish Federal Council had 2,000 members in Copenhagen, while in the United States towards the end of 1871, 27 sections composed of American, German, French, Irish, Czech, and other immigrant workers paid dues for several hundred members.⁹

Thus, the International during 1869-70 reached the peak of its development. Even during these years, its finances were in a low state, as the membership was of a fluctuating character and paid dues irregularly. Rent for the offices of the General Council was in arrears, and so was the secretary's salary of four dollars a week. But the International wielded a moral power which sprang from the devotion of its leading members and from the prestige which its name acquired among workers in the different countries, who were awakening to the idea of organization. The General Council promoted this influence by carrying on a regular correspondence with the secretaries of the national sections and

⁹ The Central Committee of the American branches of the International sent \$500 to the General Council in London during 1871 and 1700 francs to Geneva to aid the Communards.

with labor leaders of different countries, by preparing reports on the international situation, and by its appeals for financial help during strikes.

VI. THE TRIUMPH OF MARX

The expansion of the International was accompanied by a change of ideas among its membership. At the third congress of the International, held in Brussels from the 5th to the 11th of September, 1868, the "mutualists" of France went down in defeat before the "collectivists." A resolution in favor of the nationalization of land was passed by a vote of thirty to four. At the suggestion of the German delegates, the congress urged the workers of all countries to study Marx's "Capital," published the year before, and eulogized Marx as "the first political economist who had analyzed capital scientifically." The congress, in general, was marked by high spirits as was evidenced especially in its discussion of the danger of war which was then hanging over Europe. Caesar de Paepe, a Belgian delegate, demanded that in case of war, the workers should be called upon to go on a general strike so as to deprive the armies of their food supply, and to follow up the general strike by social revolution. Though not accepting all of De Paepe's suggestions, the congress urged the workers in case of war "to cease work."

Still more decisive was Marx's triumph at the fourth congress of the International in Basel, from

the 6th to the 12th of September, 1869. Though Marx was not present, his ideas were well defended by the delegates from the General Council and by those from Germany and Belgium. By this time, the ideas of "mutualism" had lost their influence even in France, and the 26 French delegates to the Basel congress were now "collectivists." The congress went on record in favor of the collective ownership of the means of transportation; it recommended the formation of national and international trade unions not only because they were necessary for defense against employers, but also because they were the "cells of the society of the future." The resolution on trade unions reflected the influence also of Bakunin, who was a delegate to the congress.¹⁰

While triumphing at the congresses, Marx also became the dominating spirit of the General Council. Though the English trade unionists continued to form a majority of the Council, they were no longer much interested in its proceedings. On the other hand, Marx, who was relaxing from his work on "*Das Kapital*" published in 1867, and whose health and financial condition were improving, threw himself into the affairs of the International with great energy

¹⁰ At the Basel congress, American labor was represented by A. C. Cameron, who was sent by the National Labor Union chiefly to discuss the project of an International Migration Bureau. Cameron told the congress that he represented 800,000 organized workers. He took no part in the proceedings, and nothing came of the idea of a Migration Bureau.

and real zest. In 1870, he found a devoted second in Engels who gave up his business in Manchester and moved to London.

VII. DECLINE AND DISSOLUTION

Marx's triumph, however, was short lived. From a promising organization in 1869-70, the International became a moribund body in 1871-72. This rapid decline began with the outbreak of the Franco-Prussian War in July, 1870. On the heels of the war, in March, 1871, came the Paris Commune. The Commune was not the work of the International, though members of the French sections of the International took an important part in it from beginning to end. But the International approved both the purpose and the method of the Commune. At the request of the General Council, Marx wrote an "Address," known under the title of the "Civil War in France," in which he hailed the Commune as the first revolution in which the workers proved themselves "capable of social initiative." This "Address," published as an official document of the International, completely alienated the British trade unionists. With one exception, the leaders of the English trade unions who were still members of the General Council, resigned. On the Continent of Europe, the suppression of the Commune destroyed the labor organizations of France and had a disintegrating effect on those of other countries. Various governments used the Commune as a pretext for the sup-

pression of workers' associations and for prohibiting international labor affiliations.¹¹

While weakened by external events, the International was plunged into an internal struggle which took the form of a clash between Marx and Bakunin, who were incompatible in temperament. Marx was studious, erudite, systematic; a revolutionist through the processes of logic; a man of great social passion who, however, thought of revolution as an orderly process under control. Bakunin was a foot-loose conspirator, impulsive, incapable of methodical thinking or writing, eloquent, brilliant in conversation, changeable, always ready for revolutionary adventure, indiscriminate in the choice of methods and associates, convinced that the "unloosing of evil passions" was a good thing and that destruction was more necessary than construction, or, as he phrased it, that the "Spirit of destruction was the Spirit of creation"; in brief, an "amorphous pan-destroyer," as Marx called him. Two such individuals could not very well lead one organization.

But the differences between Marx and Bakunin personified a struggle which had its roots deeper. The International carried within itself elements

¹¹ In 1871 a law was passed in France making it a crime to belong to the International. In the same year, Beust, premier of Hungary, obtained an appropriation of 3,000,000 gulden to check "the dangerous spread of the International over Europe." In September, 1871, Bismarck, Beust, and Stieber held a secret meeting to discuss measures against the International, and early in 1872, the government of Spain appealed to other governments of Europe to suppress the International.

which it was hard to reconcile. There was a conflict of social ideas, of two concepts of social revolution which had evolved out of the socialist thinking of the preceding half-century. On the one hand was Marx's concept of a social revolution carried out by a politically organized working class seizing political power and using the powers of the state to inaugurate measures for the socialization of economic life. Bakunin denounced this concept as "autocratic communism," as a "German-Jewish form of socialism" which would spell slavery to the people. To Bakunin, freedom and equality could come only through a revolution which would abolish at once not only property, but also the state, and which would transform society into a flexible system of free co-operative associations. These differences of concept were real issues to the members of the International, stirring their minds and rousing their passions.

Aside from ideas, there were other factors of division. There was the conflict between central control and local authority. The local, and especially the national, sections were becoming impatient with the General Council. There was friction between the trade unions interested chiefly in economic matters and the mixed sections which had more zest for political preoccupations. And finally, there were differences in the economic and political backgrounds of the labor movements of the different countries, which tended to draw the attention of the workers

in these countries from international issues to national problems.

These basic conflicts were confused in the fight with personal issues. Bakunin and his followers accused Marx and Engels of autocratic methods, of failure to obey the instructions of the congresses, of falsifying the constitution of the International so as to commit the latter to parliamentary politics, and of misrepresenting the current events in the labor movements of the affiliated countries. They demanded the abolition of the General Council and a restatement of the aims of the International which would make of it an anti-political, revolutionary organization with a collectivist and federalist program. Marx, in his turn, attacked the character of Bakunin and of his friends, accused them of intriguing, of maintaining within the International a secret society of their own, and of trying to capture the organization by unfair methods. He demanded the expulsion of Bakunin and of his chief aides from the International. The struggle between the two factions was carried on in violent and abusive language.

At the congress of the International, held at The Hague in September, 1872, the fight came to a climax. Marx was present in person.¹² It was evident by this time that Marx had lost his grip on the International. Germany, the only country where Marx

¹² It was the only congress of the International which Marx attended.

was strong, was out of it. In other countries, his followers consisted of small groups, largely outside the trade union movement. Even in the General Council Marx had at this time few friends.¹³ In the countries where the International was still a factor in the labor movement, namely, Belgium, France, Switzerland, Spain, and Italy, Bakunin and his friends were in control. None the less, Marx secured for himself a majority of the 65 delegates present. Bakunin and several of his friends were expelled. A resolution in favor of political action was passed. To take the International out of the reach of Bakuninists and Blanquists, it was decided by a vote of 31 against 14, 11 abstaining, to transfer the headquarters to New York.¹⁴

The followers of Bakunin held a separate congress at St. Imier in September, 1872, and declared their intention to continue an international association of their own.

With the transfer of the General Council to New York, the First International practically ceased to exist. The new General Council, of which Friedrich Sorge became secretary, could not maintain contacts with Europe. Its time was largely consumed in internal fights and petty squabbles. Similar conditions prevailed in the other Marxist "sections" of

¹³ Marx incensed British labor leaders by a statement that they had "sold out" to Disraeli and to Gladstone. Others were alienated by the cold and calculating methods of Engels.

¹⁴ At this time, the International had a deficit of \$125 to the members of the General Council.

the International, and Engels had to report in May, 1873, that their followers "were asleep." The Bakuninist sections, after another flicker of life in Switzerland, Belgium, Italy, and Spain, in 1872-73, became reduced to small sectarian groups. Marxists and Bakuninists fought each other everywhere in bitterest fashion. The Marxist sections formally dissolved the International at a meeting of the General Council in Philadelphia in 1876. The Bakuninists held their last gathering at Verviers in 1878. But some sections of Marxists and Bakuninists persisted into the early eighties.

It is usually said that the International went under as a result of the struggle between Marx and Bakunin. The fact is that this struggle was merely one phase of the decline of the International. The first blow to the International was its desertion by the English trade unionists who became apprehensive of its socialistic tendencies. The strong nationalistic sentiments aroused by the Franco-Prussian war and the specter of revolution conjured up by the Paris Commune made its existence in Germany impossible and destroyed it in France. The suppression of the Paris Commune broke the courage of revolutionists and their faith in a speedy triumph of socialist ideas;¹⁵ while the prolonged industrial de-

¹⁵ Bakunin died in 1876, broken in health and disillusioned in the "revolutionary instincts" of the people. Marx lived till 1883, but during the last ten years of his life he suffered physically and mentally and was "slowly dying."

pression of 1873-79 weakened trade union organization in all western countries.

In general, the life of the First International coincided with the main tendencies of the third quarter of the nineteenth century. Its rise fell in with the movement, between 1859 and 1870, towards the ideal of free trade which Richard Cobden had preached since 1836, and with the tendency to form international associations and agreements in all fields of economic and social life. On the other hand, the decline of the First International followed the progress of nationalism between 1870 and 1880. The unification of Italy and Germany, the national reorganization of Russia after the Crimean War, the national consolidation of the United States following upon the Civil War, the formation of new national states in the Balkans, the modernization of Japan, were manifestations of a nationalism which had an immediate effect on the forms and methods of the labor movement.

VIII. THE LEGEND AND THE FACTS

For a number of years after its decline, the First International was pictured as a secret society with large treasures and armies of followers ready to provoke revolution and disorder. A legend grew up in the early seventies which was used by some governments to suppress labor organizations of every kind. In fact, however, the First International was never the powerful organization it has been pre-

sented to be by its enemies and by its uncritical friends. It was a mere beginning in international labor organization, and its General Council was "a brilliant staff without an army." It never succeeded in carrying out many of its objects such as publishing a bulletin, collecting statistics of labor, making reports on working conditions in different countries, or promoting international aid in wage movements.

None the less, the First International was a big event in the labor and social movement. It helped to make the first contacts between labor leaders of different countries. It gave publicity to most of the ideas which were later to become the common demands of labor in different countries, such as bureaus of labor statistics, the eight-hour day, international labor legislation, the need of international trade unions, workers' control, and the general strike. It gave the first impulse to trade union organization in many countries of Europe. It clarified the doctrines of modern socialism and was the source of other social doctrines such as communistic anarchism and syndicalism which influenced the labor movement in later years. It brought the term "internationalism" into the dictionary, and inspired the battle-song of international revolution, *L'Internationale*.¹⁰

¹⁰ *L'Internationale* is French in origin. The poem was composed by Eugene Pottier under the impression of the Paris Commune. Published in the eighties, the poem was set to music in 1886. The authorship of the music has been a matter of dispute between two brothers, Adolph and Pierre Degeyter, from the city of Lille in Northern France.

It is thus understandable why the memory of the First International came to hold such a large place in the labor and social movements of later years. It was the great example, the great tradition to which the movements of a later day turned for inspiration and to which they were eager to trace their own ideas and doings.

PART II

PEACE AND PROGRESS. 1880-1914

CHAPTER III

THE SECOND INTERNATIONAL, 1889-1914

In the course of the economic and political transformations which marked the period of the First International, the prevailing belief was that the "roaring loom of time" was weaving for all countries the "fashionable European fabric of the sixties" of which England was the sample.¹ But before another decade had passed, it became clear that history was putting new strands in place of the old: protectionism instead of free trade, industrial combination instead of small individual enterprise, mercantilist nationalism instead of commercial cosmopolitanism, government regulation instead of laissez faire, collectivism instead of liberalism. By the beginning of the twentieth century, these new strands were beginning to be thought of as elements of a new world texture; and a decade and a half later, the design of this new fabric was laid bare to the eyes of all men by the World War.

Though carrying along many elements of conflict, the three and a half decades after 1880 remained essentially years of peace and progress. The industrial

¹ Clapham, J. H., *The Economic Development of France and Germany*, p. 325.

development of new countries, the division of the unappropriated areas of the world, especially of Africa, the mapping out of "spheres of influence" by the Great Powers, the political ambitions of small nationalities, and popular democratic movements exploded at intervals in diplomatic crises, wars, and revolutions. But these conflicts did not change the main features of the period which were those of evolutionary progress.

In the history of international labor relations, these years were also a period of growth and progress. Not one, but several international organizations of, by, and for labor came into being, and these were no longer connected with the names of individuals, but based on large political and industrial associations in many countries. The international labor and socialist movement assumed a mass character.

The organizations which during this period come within our ken were the Second International, the International Labor Secretariat, the International Trade Secretariats, the International Association for Labor Legislation, and the International Secretariat of Christian Labor Unions. Of these, the organization known as the Second International was the most important. In membership, in number of countries affiliated, in program, in the character of its leaders, and in the attention it attracted, it became the outstanding organization of the period, and its life-course is the central theme in the story of international labor relations during this period.

I. POSSIBILISTS, IMPOSSIBILISTS, PURE AND SIMPLE

The Second International had its origin in a congress held in Paris in 1889. During the eighties, socialist parties and trade unions gained ground either openly or covertly in many countries. In Germany, the Social Democratic Party, though persecuted under the anti-socialist law of Bismarck,² grew in numbers and cohesion. In France, Jules Guesde, amnestied for his part in the Paris Commune, had captured the young trade union movement in 1879, and after 1880 organized a strong political socialist party. In rivalry to the Guesdists, four other socialist groups known as Possibilists, Allemanists, Blanquists, and Independents sprang up and were making headway in the trade unions and among the voters of France. In England, the Social Democratic Federation was formed in 1880, by H. M. Hyndman, William Morris, John Burns, and Tom Mann, for the study of Marxian ideas, while in 1883 the Fabian Society was founded by Sidney Webb, George Bernard Shaw, and H. G. Wells. Under the influence of these organizations, and of disturbing economic conditions, a new group of trade union leaders came forward who attacked the old British trade unions as "burial and coffin societies" and who set out to connect trade unionism with socialism. In 1889, the birth year of the Second International, some of these trade union-

² This law was passed in 1878.

ists—John Burns, Tom Mann, Ben Tillett—led the dockers' strike in London which marked the entrance of the unskilled laborer upon the industrial scene and the beginning of a "new unionism" which was to prove later a fertile ground for socialist ideas.

In other countries of Europe and in the United States of America, socialism was likewise fermenting. In Denmark, socialists won their first two seats in parliament in 1884. In Sweden, Branting founded two socialist papers in 1885 and promoted the formation of the Swedish Social Democratic Party in 1887. 1885 marked the founding of the Belgian Labor Party; 1888 saw the first socialist congress in Austria; the same year the socialist groups of Switzerland formed the Swiss Socialist Party. In Italy, a socialist party was in process of formation, though it did not definitely constitute itself until 1892. Socialist groups were laying the foundations of underground party organizations in Russia and Finland. In the United States, the Socialist Labor Party, organized in 1877, was making its first steps in national politics.

Though representing a common cause, these socialist parties were far from agreement on all points. The socialists in Germany, Austria, Belgium, were Marxists; so were some of the socialist groups in other countries, as the Guesdists in France, the Social Democratic Federation in England, and the Socialist Labor Party in America. Some of the leaders of these groups had been in contact with Marx and car-

ried over his ideas into the movement of the eighties. But the Fabians in England, the Possibilists in France, and various socialist groups in other countries derived their philosophies from other sources than the writings of Marx. The most important differences of opinion between these groups and parties were on method and tactics. The Marxists, as a rule, expected a "social revolution" in the not distant future,³ for which they wanted to prepare the workers politically and economically; though they participated in parliamentary politics, they regarded this merely as a method of propaganda and agitation which did not preclude the need for a revolutionary upheaval in the future. The Fabians, Possibilists, and other non-Marxian Socialists were, on the contrary, interested in obtaining a gradual improvement in the life of the workers and stressed the need of gaining political influence in national and municipal legislative bodies.

While disagreeing among themselves, the socialists had to meet opposition from the outside. On the one hand were the anarchists. After the Bakuninist sections of the First International disintegrated, the followers of Bakuninism rallied around new leaders—Peter Kropotkin, Elie Reclus, Enrico Malatesta, John Most—who combined the ideas of Proudhon, Bakunin, and Marx, in a new doctrine which

³ In 1887, Hyndman, the leader of the British Marxists, predicted a complete "international social revolution" before the end of the century.

they designated as communist-anarchism. In 1881, they organized in London the International Working People's Association, otherwise known as the "Black International," which became especially active in France, Italy, Spain, and in the United States where it played a rôle in the labor movement which culminated in the Chicago Haymarket tragedy of 1886-7. The followers of the Black International, who were convinced that "the social revolution" was impending, denounced parliamentary tactics and peaceful methods and called upon "workers and revolutionists" to "oppose capitalism" by "armed resistance" and by the "propaganda of the deed." •

While harassed by the communist-anarchists on the left, the socialists were attacked on the right by the "pure and simple" trade unionists. The leaders of the British trade unions, of the newly organized American Federation of Labor, and of the more stable trade unions in France were especially active in their opposition to socialism and revolutionism, and advocated trade unionism as the one and only method of improving the condition of the workers.

II. SEPARATING THE SHEEP FROM THE GOATS

There was rivalry between these various groups in starting an international organization. The first to try were the moderate socialists of Paris, known as Possibilists. With the help of the Parliamentary Committee of the British Trade Union Congress, they convened two successive conferences in Paris

in October, 1883, and in August, 1886, but these brought together only a few people and were of little importance.

Another attempt was made by the Parliamentary Committee of the British Trade Union Congress itself, which convened a conference in London in November, 1888. This London conference issued a call for an international congress to be held in Paris in 1889. At the same time, the German socialists issued an invitation to all socialist and labor organizations to meet also in Paris.

Two rival socialist congresses were thus held in Paris in July, 1889. The occasion was a festive one, the centenary of the Great French Revolution. The International Exhibition arranged by the French government to rejoice in the progress of industry and democracy, attracted large numbers of people from all corners of the globe, and sixty-nine international congresses were held in Paris at the time. Both socialist and labor congresses were well attended. The one called by the German socialists and organized by the French Guesdists, met at Rue Petrelle and had 391 delegates, from 20 countries, including the United States; the other arranged by the British trade unionists and French Possibilists met in Rue Lancry.

Efforts to bring the two congresses under one roof failed. An English socialist wrote in later years about these congresses as follows: "So two mutually recriminating congresses were held in separate halls

by Possibilists and Impossibilists respectively, the anarchists being impartially present at both. This publication of the incapacity of socialist fraternities to fraternize was greeted with storms of derision by the unregenerate world.”⁴

The significance of the two congresses, however, lay in the fact that it brought together the men and women who for a generation were to be the central figures in the labor and socialist movements of the world: Keir Hardie from England; Wilhelm Liebknecht, Bebel, Bernstein, Vollmar, Clara Zetkin, from Germany; Jules Guesde, Lafargue, Vaillant, Longuet, from France; Anseele and Vandervelde, from Belgium; Andreas Costa and Cipriani from Italy; Victor Adler from Austria; Domela Nieuwenhuis from Holland; Pablo Iglesias from Spain; George Plekhanov from Russia. The reports on labor and socialist developments in Europe and America revealed to these men and women the varied, active, and discordant movements which had sprung up since 1878 and out of which it was intended to build a unified international organization.

Of the several questions considered at the congress arranged by the Guesdists, which is regarded as the first congress of the Second International, the most important was that of international labor legislation. The question was just becoming one of practical politics as a result of the invitation sent out by the

⁴ Hyndman, H. M., *The Evolution of Revolution*, p. 347.

federal government of Switzerland to various governments in Europe to attend an international conference in Bern for the consideration of the international regulation of labor conditions. Under the influence of the German socialists, the congress rejected the arguments of those who reasoned that "labor legislation was incompatible with socialist principles," formulated a program of international labor laws, and called upon the trade unions and the socialist parties of all countries to support the action of the Swiss government.

The congress also adopted a resolution to support the movement for an eight-hour day which the American Federation of Labor was carrying on in the United States. The A. F. of L. was not represented at either of the Paris congresses, but sent "greetings" to both, and called the attention of both to its campaign for an eight-hour day, which was to begin on May 1, 1890. At the suggestion of a French trade unionist, Lavigne, the American idea was endorsed, and it was decided to arrange on May 1, 1890, an "international manifestation" in favor of the eight-hour day, thus laying the foundation for the international socialist May Day.⁵

This Paris congress thus made a beginning in bringing order into the socialist confusion of the day. The process was carried on at the congresses of Brussels in 1891, and of Zurich in 1893. Between 1891

⁵ The character of May Day was more definitely fixed at the congresses of Brussels in 1891 and of Zurich in 1893.

and 1893, many French and Dutch socialists were swept off their feet by enthusiasm for the theory of the General Strike as a means of ushering in the social revolution and of preventing war.⁶ But under German leadership, these and other ideas and proposals which had a taint of anarchism or Bakuninism were fought off.

The final act of socialist demarcation was accomplished at the London congress of 1896. Much excitement prevailed at this gathering, and many of the sessions were disorderly. In vain were pleas for tolerance and for a broad spirit of co-operation. By this time, the political socialists of all countries felt that there was nothing in common between them and the anarchists and anti-parliamentarians. They shared the indignation which had been aroused by the terroristic acts of French and Italian anarchists,⁷ and they were tired of discussions on the subject of political action. They felt that in the national socialist parties there was now enough uniformity to form a basis for an international organization, and they believed that they could keep the trade unions in their tow. They thus definitely and finally excluded the anarchists and anti-parliamentarians from their congresses and adopted rules ad-

⁶ Among the early protagonists of the General Strike was Aristide Briand.

⁷ Between 1890 and 1896, anarchists in many countries had staged riots and terroristic acts. The greatest consternation was aroused by the acts of Ravachol in 1892, of A. Vaillant in 1893, and by the assassination of President Carnot in 1894.

mitting only political socialist parties and trade unions.

Having marked themselves off from the anarchists, the socialists proceeded to solidify their own ranks, and a committee was appointed to prepare the basis for a permanent organization.⁸

III. NEW VARIATIONS ON AN OLD THEME

But before the socialists could carry out the task set by the London congress, their leaders had to work out a compromise between new conflicting tendencies. For in the decade which followed the congress of 1896, the earlier differences of doctrine and tactics took on new form, nationally and internationally.

1. Reform and Revolution

Two issues in particular divided the socialist world during these years. One was the broad question of revolution and reform; the other was a more specific one—the relations of the political socialist parties to the trade unions. The first was a result of the very progress of socialism during these years. As pointed

⁸ Until then each congress had selected the time and place for its successor and had placed the responsibility for arrangements upon the party in whose territory it was to convene. The Belgians managed the congress in 1891, the Swiss in 1893, the British in 1896. Expenses were covered by each country financing its own delegation and by voluntary contributions. As the services of stenographers or interpreters were beyond the means of the congresses, the clerical work was performed by the delegates themselves. Inevitably, these congresses were meagerly financed, and poorly managed.

out above, in the eighties and early nineties large sections of the socialist movement in different countries took up Marxism as their banner. This was largely due to the indefatigable work of Engels, and of a group of young writers, Jules Guesde, Paul Lafargue, H. M. Hyndman, Daniel de Leon, Karl Kautsky, George Plekhanov, and Filippo Turati, who popularized Marx's ideas and gave them wide currency. The outstanding figure in this group was Karl Kautsky, who became the leading theorist of the socialist world.⁹ In 1891 he drafted the program of the German Social Democratic Party, known as the Erfurt Program, which became the model for socialists of other countries. In this program and in the commentary which he wrote for it, Kautsky presented what became during the two decades before the World War the classic exposition of the Marxian theories of the concentration of capital, of the increasing misery of the proletariat, of the disappearance of the middle classes, of an inevitable social revolution, and of the necessity of organizing the workers into an independent political party for the conquest of political power.

But even those socialists who paid homage to Marx were confronted in most countries by conditions which were far removed from the picture drawn by Marx writing in England, the "Workshop

⁹ Kautsky has described himself as "an International in miniature," being the son of a Czech father and a German mother with Slavonic and Italian ancestry, and a citizen of Austria.

of the World." Germany alone in Europe, and the United States of America, were rapidly becoming industrialized. Scandinavia, Switzerland, Austria-Hungary were still devoid of large-scale manufacturing. In Russia, only the foundations were being laid for industrialism, while the older forms of economic life were the rule in Italy and in the Balkans. In most countries, popular grievances centered about feudal and oligarchic inequalities in the political system. The first task which the socialists were thus faced with was to democratize the instruments of government: establish manhood suffrage, the rights of free speech, free assemblage and free combination, to introduce pay for members of parliament, to win free, public, and secular education. In addition to these political reforms, the social democratic parties were called upon to help the workers to improve working and living conditions, and to put forth demands for protective labor laws, for social insurance, for more popular methods of taxation, for tariff reform. The German Social Democratic Party met this situation by attaching to the general part of the Erfurt Program a long list of "immediate demands" which were supposed to be attainable under capitalism without removing the need and possibility of social revolution in the future. Their example was followed by the socialist parties of other countries.

A double conflict developed out of this situation. On the one hand, the "revolutionists" began to fear

that parliamentary tactics were destroying the militancy of the socialist parties and that in the effort to win votes, the socialists were relegating the ideas of a complete social revolution into the background. On the other hand, the moderates or "opportunists," encouraged by the progressive rise in the workers' standards of living during the nineties, began to question the validity of a "revolutionary end" and urged the socialists to give up traditional modes of thinking about revolution, and to concentrate on measures of reform in the expectation that a socialist society would evolve gradually. Between the "revolutionists" and the "opportunists" the "Marxists" tried to hold their ground, claiming that reforms strengthened the position of the workers, that the socialist parties were growing rapidly, and that as soon as they had majorities in the various parliaments, they would take over the government and reorganize economic and political life on a socialist basis. Against the "opportunists," the Marxists insisted on the idea of "the conquest of power" to carry out the "transition" from capitalism to socialism. Against the "revolutionists," the Marxists maintained the necessity of parliamentary tactics and of waiting until the socialist parties were in the majority.¹⁰

¹⁰ In 1905, Kautsky wrote a book under the title *The Road to Power* which presented a concrete picture of the Social Revolution according to the Marxists. It was translated into many languages and was accepted as the standard socialist forecast.

a. Alexander Millerand and Jean Jaurès

The conflict came to the surface first in the two most advanced socialist countries of Europe, Germany and France. In France, it became a political issue as a result of the *cas Millerand*. In 1899, Alexander Millerand, a member of the Independent Socialist Party, accepted, on his own responsibility, the post of Minister of Industry in the cabinet of Waldeck-Rousseau. The Dreyfus affair was then at its most critical stage, the French Republic was in danger, and Millerand entered a "bourgeois ministry" to save the cause of French democracy. In this he was supported by several socialist groups under the leadership of Jean Jaurès. But his action was violently opposed by Jules Guesde and Vaillant and by their followers who regarded it as a betrayal of the principle of the class struggle.

b. Karl Kautsky and Eduard Bernstein

In Germany, the question was raised, not by any specific incident, but by the writings of Eduard Bernstein, whose book on *Die Voraussetzungen des Sozialismus* in 1899 created a sensation. In this book, Bernstein called for a "revision" of the Marxian theories of surplus-value, of capitalist concentration, of the progressive pauperization of the working class, of the economic interpretation of history; made light of social revolution as a "final end"; and advocated political alliances with non-socialist parties for the promotion of democratic and social

reforms. Bernstein supplied a theoretical basis for the practice of those socialists who had become interested in social reform and indifferent to revolution. For a while, it looked as if the compact and unified socialist party of Germany would be split in the manner of the French party. But at the congress of the German Social-Democracy held in Dresden in 1903, the "Marxists," Bebel and Kautsky, succeeded in maintaining unity and yet beating the "revisionists," as the followers of Bernstein were called, in a resolution which condemned the participation of socialists in "bourgeois" governments.¹¹

Between 1899 and 1904, the issue raised by the *cas Millerand* and by the writings of Bernstein ceased to be local. In all countries where socialism had an organization, the battle raged between "Marxists" and "Revisionists," "revolutionists" and "opportunists." In France, it was Jaurès against Jules Guesde; in Italy—Enrico Ferri against Filippo Turati; in the incipient Russian socialist movement it was the Bolshevik Lenin against the Mensheviks Martoff¹² and Plekhanov; in Germany, it was Bebel and Kautsky against Bernstein and Vollmar; in Eng-

¹¹ The resolution read: "The congress rejects most emphatically the revisionist tendencies which would transform tactics based on the class struggle into politics of concessions to the established order. The Party declines all responsibility for participation in present day governments; it rejects all efforts to cover up the growing class antagonism, and it pledges its growing strength to a renewed fight for the interests of the workers."

¹² The split in the Russian Social-Democratic Party between Bolsheviks and Mensheviks took place in 1903, and was a phase of the general trend described.

land, it was Hyndman and the Social Democratic Federation against Ramsay MacDonald and Henderson of the Independent Labor Party; in the United States, it was De Leon of the Socialist Labor Party against Hillquit of the Socialist Party; and the same groups appeared in other countries under a variety of names.

2. Trade Unions and Socialism

Closely related to the question of revolution and reform was that of the relation of the political socialist parties to trade unionism. From the very start, the socialist parties which sprang up in the late seventies and early eighties, looked upon the trade unions as an essential element of the social movement. In all countries, the socialists helped to form local and national trade unions and also took the first steps to make international agreements between unions of different countries. By 1896 the socialist position on the question had become standardized. According to this position, trade unions were necessary to "better the condition of the toilers"; strikes and boycotts were recognized as appropriate methods of struggle for better working conditions, but they were to be used cautiously and only when warranted by organization. The national consolidation of trade unions in each country was urged, and international co-operation between unions was recommended. At the same time, trade union action was regarded as secondary to political action, and the trade unions

were urged to accept the guidance of the political socialist movement.

In this effort to control the trade unions, the socialists met with varying success. In Germany, Austria-Hungary, Switzerland, Holland, Denmark, Sweden, Norway, Belgium, and Italy, the socialist parties were growing during these years more rapidly than trade unions, and were fighting for political and economic rights in a way which made them the spokesmen of all the working people. Though not without some struggle, the trade unions in these countries accepted the political leadership of the socialists. The unions confined themselves to building up benefit systems, carrying on wage negotiations, and developing methods of collective bargaining, while the socialist parties were regarded as fighting the larger battles of labor.

But in England, the United States, and France, the socialists had hard sledding with the trade unions. In England, the Independent Labor Party, which the "new unionists," under the leadership of Keir Hardie, organized in 1893, made but slow progress. Though in the early years of the twentieth century the British trade unions turned toward independent political action, their attitude towards the socialists changed but slowly.

In the United States, the socialists fared even worse. The American Federation of Labor, which began to grow rapidly after 1897, assumed a policy of "no-politics" in the union, and its leadership was

definitely hostile to the socialists. The Socialist Labor Party, impatient with the A. F. of L., organized a Socialist Trade and Labor Alliance to fight it. This caused a split in the Socialist Labor Party and resulted in the formation in 1901 of the Socialist Party which was determined to support the A. F. of L. in the hope of winning it over. But before long, another division occurred, and a considerable element of the Socialist Party combined with the Socialist Labor Party and with the leaders of the labor unions which had grown up in the West to organize in 1904 the Industrial Workers of the World in opposition to the A. F. of L. Thus, socialism in the United States not only missed its aim of winning the trade unions, but became involved in the meshes of dualism.

But the deepest cleavage between socialists and trade unionists was in France. As the socialists of France continued to be split up into warring groups, there developed a reaction in the trade unions against socialist politics. The anarchists, who had become wearied of "propaganda of the deed," took advantage of this. Entering the unions between 1895 and 1900 *en masse*, they organized the General Confederation of Labor on a non-political basis and began asserting the supremacy of industrial organization over political parties. By 1904, they, in co-operation with a group of intellectuals, developed what became known as Revolutionary Syndicalism, a doctrine which set itself up against both socialism

and trade unionism. In opposition to socialism, the syndicalists rejected parliamentary action as tending to obscure the "class struggle," denounced the Marxist ideas of the "conquest of power," and revived the Bakuninist conception that the workers must destroy the state as well as private property in order to carry out a socialist revolution. In opposition to trade unionism, the syndicalists criticized high dues, benefits, peaceful wage regulation, and collective agreements. Instead, the syndicalists urged class struggles in industry, "direct action," including sabotage, to obtain immediate reforms, and the General Strike as the means to abolish capitalism and to carry out the Social Revolution.

3. Marxism, Revisionism, Syndicalism, Trade Unionism

Between 1899 and 1904, the labor and social movement of Europe and America thus split up between four main economic and social doctrines: Marxism, Revisionism, Syndicalism, and Trade Unionism. Under the influence of varying political and economic conditions, these divisions resulted in the formation of several types of social movements. In Germany, Austria-Hungary, Scandinavia, Belgium, Holland, Switzerland, and several other countries, the German-Austrian type gained the upper hand. In these countries strong and united political socialist parties, supported by solid and growing trade unions, were professedly Marxian in aim and method, allowing at the same time wide scope to "Revisionist" ideas

and practices. In France, socialism tended to be broad and humanitarian, to play politics with other democratic parties, and at the same time to compromise with the syndicalists. In Eastern Europe, especially in Russia, the conspirative type prevailed, and the socialist and labor organizations went underground to overthrow Czarism, establish democracy, give land to the peasants and social reforms to the workers. In England, the social movement was characterized by strong, independent trade unions, loosely federated and maintaining for their own ends a political labor party in which a socialist minority ploughed the ground for socialist ideas. In contrast to these European types was the type evolved in America where a small socialist movement was overshadowed by a growing trade unionism, wage-conscious in spirit, anti-socialist in outlook, and non-political in form. In a few countries like Italy and Spain, the German-Austrian and French types developed side by side.

IV. THE PARLIAMENT OF THE PROLETARIAT

1. Credo and Organization

By steering a cautious course amidst these movements, the socialists at two successive congresses, held in Paris in 1900 and in Amsterdam in 1904, succeeded in forming a permanent organization. At the Paris congress, rules were laid down for admission to the socialist congresses. Only such political groups and parties were to be admitted

which believed in the "fundamental principles of socialism," that is, in the socialization of the means of production, in the international organization and action of the workers, and in the conquest of political power by the proletariat organized into a political party on a class basis. The door was left open for trade unions which did not take part directly in politics, but which "placed themselves on the basis of the class-struggle" and which recognized "the necessity of political action through legislation and parliamentarism."

The congresses, which before 1900 had been variously designated, were henceforth to be known as International Socialist Congresses. A permanent International Socialist Bureau was established, with an annual budget of 10,000 francs, and a paid secretary. The Bureau was to be composed of two delegates from each national delegation to the international congresses and was to meet four times a year. In the interval between these meetings, the Bureau was to be managed by the executive committee of the Belgian Labor Party, and the headquarters of the Bureau were placed in Brussels. The secretary was charged with the task of calling the international congresses, of codifying the resolutions, publishing and distributing the reports of proceedings, collecting information, and making reports on current social questions.

To the delegates assembled at the Paris congress, these steps were an indication of the great advance

made since 1889. At last, it was felt, a "Second International" had been founded which could claim the right to be the heir to the First International. In the preamble to the resolution creating the Bureau, this feeling was expressed in a terse sentence which declared to the world that the international socialist congresses were destined "to become the Parliament of the Proletariat" whose resolutions would "guide the proletariat in the struggle for deliverance."

At Amsterdam, the Second International went further and attempted to unify the varying socialist movements under German-Austrian leadership. Proud of the three million votes polled in the German elections of 1903, the German socialists now took the aggressive and demanded that the "Dresden resolution" become the platform of the international socialist movement. After a "titanic international duel" between Jaurès and Bebel and an "ardent and passionate" debate which lasted four days, the congress adopted the "Dresden resolution." At the same time, the syndicalist ideas on trade unions and the General Strike were rejected.

2. Congresses and Leadership

With the Amsterdam congress the Second International entered upon the period of its greatest prestige and influence. The Amsterdam congress itself was a large and well organized affair which aroused much attention in the press of the world. The 444

delegates present represented the largest and most coherent international social movement ever known. For the first time, a delegate had arrived from Japan. As the Dutch socialist Van Kol greeted the assembly, he pointed to the contrast between 1904 and 1872 when the few dozen delegates of the First International had met at The Hague in a little café to bury their organization. In 30 years, a handful of exiles and hunted men had given birth to a world movement.

After 1904, the Second International assumed an intellectual leadership in the socialist world which was undisputed. In 1905, it carried out the unification of the French socialist groups resulting in the formation of the Unified Socialist Party of France. In 1907 and 1910, it arranged impressive international congresses at Stuttgart and at Copenhagen. Among the 886 delegates from 26 nationalities who attended the Stuttgart congress, and among the 896 delegates from 23 nationalities who came to Copenhagen in 1910, were many men and women of outstanding personality and of growing influence in the political and social life of their respective countries. As public speakers, as writers, as editors, as members of parliaments, as leaders of trade unions, as teachers and public officials, the men and women who composed these congresses attested in their own persons the hold which international socialism was acquiring on the minds of the middle classes as well as of the workers of the civilized countries of the

world. Owing to their opportunities for reading and travel, these men and women found it comparatively easy to look out above the frontiers of national life into the realms of cosmopolitanism and to feel themselves as members of a new world civilization. More, perhaps, than any other group at this time, they were examples of the "international mind" which was said to be developing in the world, the carriers of a large internationalism which proposed to change the relations of nations and countries.

3. The International Socialist Bureau

Though less spectacular, the work of the International Socialist Bureau in Brussels also gained steadily in scope. The statutes adopted in 1900 at the Paris congress made the Second International into a federation of national socialist parties and trade unions. The executive board had only limited powers which were strictly defined. But within these limits, the Council of the Bureau, which consisted of from 50 to 70 members, and the Executive Committee, under the chairmanship of Emile Vandervelde and under the guidance of the secretary, Camille Huysmans, responded more alertly, as time went on, to international events and developments. By means of appeals, circulars, correspondence, and public meetings, the Bureau was focusing more and more the attention of socialists everywhere on lines of common policy, and was building up habits of mind which were to make the Second International

what its designers had intended it to be—the guide and arbiter in matters of international economic and social policy for the labor and socialist movement of the world.

V. COHESION AND CONFLICT

But even during these years the Second International could not achieve inner unity. Not only did the divisions between “Marxists,” “Revisionists,” and syndicalists continue, but new variations of socialist doctrine—guild socialism and industrial socialism¹³—sprang up and gained followers. Criss-crossing these lines of theory and method were other lines, marking differences of national interest. The years after 1904 were years of increasing discontent among the smaller nationalities of Europe, of large popular migrations, and of colonial expansion. Concrete problems in which nationalism and internationalism were in conflict, such as national self-determination, immigration and emigration, the rights of colonial peoples, were thrust upon the Second International and kept it in internal turmoil.

1. Nationalism and Internationalism

In a general way, the Second International tried to reconcile national rights with international ideals. It endorsed the “right of each nation to self-determination,” and threw its doors wide open to the delegates of such national groups as the Poles, the Finns, the Jews, and the nationalities of Austria.

¹³ Laidler, H. W., *op. cit.*

But the socialists were also in favor of large states, and they never faced the issue squarely as to the best method of reconciling the claims of the small nationalities with those of large political organization. The failure to face this issue caused much bitterness among the socialist and trade union groups of the smaller nationalities in such countries as Austria and Russia.

In the economic sphere as well, with regard to migration and colonialism, the Second International showed a dual character. While it made many efforts to reconcile countries of emigration and immigration, colonizing nations with colonial countries, it recognized the lines of division between "aliens" and natives, "backward" and advanced races, and acquiesced in exclusivist and exploitative colonial policies.

2. War and Peace

But the supreme issue which epitomized the basic conflicts within the Second International was that of the socialist attitude in case of war. From 1889 on, militarism and the prevention of a possible European war were discussed at every congress of the Second International, with increasing emphasis and heat. By 1900, when the Second International was definitely constituted, its position had been made clear: war was caused by the workings of the capitalist system and was always injurious to the workers; the abolition of war was not to be hoped

for short of the abolition of capitalism and the establishment of the "Co-operative Commonwealth," but it was possible to minimize the danger of war by substituting national militias for standing armies, by the limitation of armaments, by the publication of treaties, by the arbitration of international disputes, and by making the declaration of war subject to the referendum vote of the people. It was the duty of the socialists in all countries to promote these measures, to protest against specific acts of aggression, to refuse to vote credits for war services or for military expeditions, and to work ceaselessly for the triumph of socialism.

In this position there were two main weaknesses. It was generally conceded that the socialists were not bound to oppose a defensive war. Yet the difficulty of distinguishing between a defensive and an offensive war was not clearly envisaged. Secondly, none of the modes of preventive action prescribed could be successfully carried out so long as the socialists were in the minority in parliament.

There was one proposal to stop war which did not require a parliamentary majority, but only a fairly large and determined minority among the workers. That was the general strike. From 1891 on, this proposal had been urged on the Second International by anarchists, militant pacifists, and syndicalists, but without avail. With the increasing tension in the international situation after 1904, and with the example of successful general strikes in Russia in

1905 and elsewhere, it began to make headway among socialists themselves, especially in France and England, and could no longer be ignored.

It was, therefore, made the chief topic of discussion at the Stuttgart congress of 1907. No change, however, was effected in the socialist position on the question. The congress agreed with Vandervelde that "nations, like individuals, had the right of legitimate defense against an attack, or an aggression, which menaced their independence." In vain did Karl Liebknecht argue the need of a more vigorous struggle against militarism in Germany. The violent tirades of the French "anti-patriot," Gustave Hervé, merely incited the Germans to declare their readiness to defend their fatherland, in case of attack. All definite proposals in favor of a general strike or of armed insurrection in case of war were voted down. The arguments against the general strike were: that such a recommendation would expose the socialist parties to persecution by governments; that the measure could not be carried unanimously by the congress or uniformly carried out by the various parties; and that if socialists reached a degree of strength which made feasible a general strike, there would be no need for it because capitalism would have fallen.

The final resolution, the outcome of 20 years of discussion, was as follows: "If a war threatens to break out, it is the duty of the working class in the countries concerned and of their parliamentary rep-

representatives with the aid of the International Socialist Bureau to do all in their power to prevent war by all means which seem to them appropriate and which naturally vary according to the sharpness of the class struggle and the general political situation. Should war, none the less, break out, it is their duty to co-operate to bring it promptly to a close and to utilize the economic and political crisis created by the war to arouse the masses of the people and to precipitate the downfall of capitalist domination." The last paragraph was added only after Nicholas Lenin and Rosa Luxemburg made a vigorous fight on its behalf.

Though this resolution was regarded as a victory for the more militant element in the Second International, it was felt to be too vague. It was for that reason that at the Copenhagen congress in 1910, Keir Hardie, Jean Jaurès, and Edouard Vaillant made one more attempt for at least mentioning the general strike as one of the methods for combating war, leaving its use optional with various socialist parties. However, they got no further than a vote to refer the matter to the International Socialist Bureau.

3. The Way of Compromise

Thus, regardless of its growth, the Second International remained from 1904 to 1914 a loose federation of conflicting tendencies and organizations. Its device for holding together the national movements and the dissident groups within each country was

compromise. At the international congresses, under the guidance of the International Socialist Bureau, draft resolutions on the major questions of the day were collected, debated in committee by the principal leaders from all countries, then harmonized in resolutions which were presented to the congress and which were usually ratified unanimously, without further amendment. A division in plenary sessions was avoided as much as possible as a sign of weakness. If unanimity seemed in doubt, measures were postponed for further investigation. The vote was taken by nations, each national group being allotted a number of votes in proportion to its strength. No disciplinary powers were exercised.

VI. STORM SIGNALS

After the Copenhagen congress of 1910, however, the contradictions within the Second International came to the surface. Everywhere, events were fast moving toward great decisions. The expansion of business activity and of world trade which, with but one serious break in 1907-08, filled the decade of 1904-1913 and which was shared in by almost all the countries of the world,¹⁴ was bringing to a head the factors of conflict which had been developing for 30 years. From 1910 to 1913, the principal countries of the world were seriously shaken by industrial and social unrest. It took on different forms in different

¹⁴ See *Business Annals*, by W. L. Thorp, New York, 1926.

countries and had its center in different industrial groups. In England, it was the miners, railroad men, and dockers who led the new movement of big strikes. In the United States, it was the textile workers of Lowell and Patterson and the miners of Colorado. In France, it was the building trades and the railroad men. In Russia, the machinists and the gold miners of Lena were in the lead. In Mexico, it was the agrarians in co-operation with workers and intellectuals rising against Diaz. In Turkey, in the Near East, and in China, it was the intellectual classes seeking national regeneration through republican institutions.

But there was a certain unity underlying the movements of unrest in all countries. In its economic aspect, the great unrest was the result of the fact that the expansion of productive power was not in any appreciable degree benefiting the wage earners. After the advance made in the industrial countries during the nineties, a period of stationary wages followed in which the gains made by the workers in higher money wages were nullified by the steady rise in prices. In its political aspect, the unrest was the result of the progress of democracy which the spread of industrialism was bringing in its trail in Austria, Russia, in Latin America, in the Near and Far East. In its international aspect, it was the result of the redistribution of power which had taken place between the great nations of the world in consequence of the very spread of indus-

trialism. In its social aspect, it was a striving on the part of the masses of the people in most countries to raise their social status in accordance with the new consciousness of importance and power which they had acquired.

In the principal countries, governments were making efforts to meet this outburst of restlessness by means of larger industrial and social policies. The years from 1910 to 1913 witnessed a development of labor legislation and of social insurance in England, France, the United States, Austria, Russia, Japan, which set a new mark in social history. Everywhere the employing and middle classes were evolving philosophies of social reform which would serve as a basis for a higher national unity. The Neo-liberalism of Lloyd George and of Asquith, the Progressivism of Roosevelt and the New Freedom of Woodrow Wilson, the monarchic socialism of Wilhelm the Second, the new reformism of Stolypin in Russia—were all manifestations of a trend which was world-wide in scope. But in all countries there was a counter-tendency among the masses to embrace new versions of the philosophy of class struggle and of social strife.

While the Second International was finding it harder because of these new mass movements to hold together and to fight against syndicalists and anarchists, it was also called upon to meet the issue of war, not merely by resolutions but by action. After 1910, the air was filled with rumors of a gen-

eral war and one international crisis followed another in rapid succession. The Agadir incident in 1911, the Tripoli war between Italy and Turkey in the same year, the first Balkan war in 1912,¹⁵ made it clear that the Second International would soon be put to the acid test of war.

¹⁵ On this occasion, the International Socialist Bureau hurriedly convened a special conference in Basel, which urged the socialist parties of the Balkan countries to stop the war, on the basis of the Stuttgart resolution, but without effect.

CHAPTER IV

INTERNATIONAL LABOR SECRETARIATS

Side by side with the Second International, there grew up in the two decades before the War a number of more modest organizations whose object was international co-operation of, by, and for trade unions. These organizations were the several International Trade Secretariats and the International Secretariat of National Trade Union Centers. Though they were almost completely obscured by the Second International, their pre-war history is significant as first steps in a movement which was to assume larger proportions later.

I. TRADE SECRETARIATS

Efforts to form international associations of workers in one and the same craft or industry were made in a few trades during the seventies and eighties. But the real beginnings of the International Trade Secretariats fall in 1889-90. When 17 delegates of the printers' unions of France, Spain, Italy, Germany, the United States, England, Belgium, and of six other countries held the first international conference of typographical workers in Paris, in July, 1889, and when 102 delegates from

the national miners' unions of England, France, Germany, and Austria met in May, 1890, to form the International Miners' Federation, they gave the first impetus to the idea of combining workers of the same craft or trade internationally.

Aside from the example of the printers and of the miners, the formation of Trade Secretariats after 1890 was stimulated by the growth of trade unions in many countries, by strikes which attracted international attention, and by the congresses of the Second International. The latter supplied a meeting place for the officials and leaders of trade unions of different countries who were as yet unused to travel and who had no other means of getting acquainted. The records of these meetings show how slow and halting the trade unionists of different countries were in getting together, how little they knew of one another's activities, how few were the means of communication between them, how strong their national suspicions, and how difficult their first steps in forming ties of organization. Because of this, the socialist congresses of Zurich in 1893 and of London in 1896, which brought workers of many countries together, and which urged upon them the idea of international organization, did much to accelerate the process.¹ By 1900, there were already 17 Trade Secretariats; their membership, however,

¹ Some of these conferences were attended by American socialists provided with credentials from socialistic and semi-socialistic American trade unions.

was confined to a few countries of Europe and their organization was rudimentary.

From 1900 to the outbreak of the World War, the number of International Trade Secretariats increased, covering the entire field of industry. Some of these Secretariats, such as those of the miners, the printers, the lithographers, the transport workers, and the woodworkers maintained regular contacts. Twenty-four of the Secretariats had their headquarters in Germany, in the central office of the German union of the respective trade; the miners and the textile workers had theirs in England, while the commercial employees and the stoneworkers had theirs in Holland and in Switzerland, respectively. The official or secretary of the national union of the country in which headquarters were located was, as a rule, the international secretary, and carried on the work of the secretariat in his spare time.

The main effort of these Secretariats was to spread information about trade conditions in different countries, to keep members informed about strikes in their trades, to make appeals for financial aid in case of large strikes, to prevent workers of one country from acting as strike-breakers in another, and to promote trade unions in the less organized countries. A few of the Secretariats had provisions for aid to their members in search of work in foreign countries. Taken as a whole, however, the work of the Secretariats was narrow in scope and modest in results.

II. THE INTERNATIONAL SECRETARIAT OF TRADE UNION CENTERS

Wider in scope was the International Secretariat of National Trade Union Centers.² As its name indicates, its purpose was to bring together the national trade union centers of different countries for the consideration of common problems. Between 1890 and 1900 the national consolidation of labor organization made headway in many countries. While the Second International laid claim to the rôle of spokesman of the international interests of labor, the leaders of these national trade unions began to think of having an international organization of their own. The British and French trade unionists resented the domination of the socialists in the Second International, while the trade union leaders of Germany and of other Continental countries, though good and loyal socialists, felt that the Second International could not devote the necessary time and attention to the special international problems with which trade unions were beginning to be faced.

1. French Failure and German Success

The first to attempt a trade union International were the French trade unionists. They called a conference for the purpose on December 17

² The term "national trade union center" or "national center" is used to denote a national federation of national trade unions, for example, the American Federation of Labor or the British Trade Union Congress.

and 18, 1900, in Paris, which was attended by a few delegates from Italy and England, and which discussed the establishment of an International Labor Secretariat. But their project failed to get the necessary support.

About the same time, J. Jensen, the president of the Danish Federation of Trade Unions, took up the idea with Isaac Mitchell, Secretary of the British Federation of Trade Unions, and with Carl Legien, chairman of the General Committee of the German Trade Unions. Jensen suggested that the national trade union centers of the different countries of Europe send fraternal delegates to a Scandinavian labor conference which was scheduled for 1901. In response to this suggestion, there was held in Copenhagen on August 21, 1901, a conference of trade union officials from Denmark, Norway, Sweden, Finland, Germany, Belgium, France, and England. The conference, under the guidance of Carl Legien, talked over somewhat informally the idea of holding international trade union congresses. Legien and most of the others in attendance, felt that the Second International was the proper forum for the discussion of the larger problems of labor and that international trade union congresses were unnecessary. They were in favor, however, of periodic conferences of the secretaries of national trade union centers.

In accordance with their decision, a second conference was held in 1902, in Stuttgart, which was

attended by the secretaries of national trade unions of eleven countries—Norway, Denmark, Sweden, Germany, Austria, Holland, Belgium, France, England, Switzerland, and Spain. The Stuttgart conference reaffirmed the decisions of Copenhagen and authorized the national trade union center of Germany to act as International Center until the following conference. Legien proposed that Germany should pay the costs of the organization for the year, which was readily agreed to.

A formal organization was set up at the third conference in Dublin in 1903. An International Secretariat of National Trade Union Centers was established which was to hold conferences biennially. Expenses were to be covered by dues fixed at 50 pfennings, about twelve cents, per thousand members per year. It was agreed that Legien should act as International Secretary.

2. Clashing Types of Trade Unionism

From 1904 to 1908, the main problem before the International Secretariat was whether it would be able to hold together the different types of trade unionism in the different countries. From the very first conference in Copenhagen, it was clear that three such types were confronting each other. There was the socialist-reformist trade unionism of the German-Austrian model, characterized by highly centralized, well-disciplined, financially strong trade unions, by strong benefit features and peaceful

methods of collective bargaining, and by a close alliance with the socialist parties. The other type, represented by most of the trade unions of England and of the United States, was largely decentralized, more craft than industrial in organization, wage-conscious rather than class-conscious, interested primarily in collective bargaining, and non-socialist, if not anti-socialist. While opposed to both was the third type, represented by French syndicalism, revolutionary in aim and militant in method.³

The clash between these types of unionism came when, in 1904, the French Confederation of Labor demanded that the questions of anti-militarism and of the general strike should be placed on the agenda of the next conference. After a rather sharp correspondence between the Confederation of Labor and Legien, the French proposal was submitted to the other national centers and was rejected. As a result, the French stayed away from the conference held in 1905 in Amsterdam. At the same time, the American Federation of Labor also declined to attend the conference. The reasons given by Gompers were that the conference consisted of officials and not of elected delegates, and that the cost would be too great. Gompers suggested that if the date of the conferences in the future were changed from June to September, the fraternal delegates of the A. F. of L. to the British

³ See Chapter III, pp. 81-82.

Trade Union Congress might be able to attend without too much loss of money or time.

As a result of this experience, the Amsterdam conference defined more clearly the purpose and method of the International Secretariat. It was decided that the latter should exclude "all theoretical questions and questions affecting the tendencies and tactics of the trade union movement in the various countries." The International Secretariat was to limit itself to deliberations "concerning the promotion of closer association between the trade unions of all countries, the collection of uniform trade union statistics, the provision of mutual support in industrial conflicts, and all other questions directly relating to the trade union organization of the working class." As a concession to the Americans, it was decided that the conferences in the future were to be composed either of secretaries or of "delegates either appointed or elected by the affiliated trade unions," each national center to have not more than two delegates.

At the conference held in Christiania in 1907, the French were again absent and for the same reasons. Though the date of the conference was changed to September, the A. F. of L. was not represented. The Christiania conference, faced by the same situation, not only restated the principles laid down in Amsterdam in 1905, but went a step further to censure the French syndicalists for their anti-socialist tactics and to endorse the Second International.

Thus, at Amsterdam and Christiania the International Secretariat made it clear that it was dominated by the socialist-reformist type of trade unionism.

None the less, in 1908, both the French and the Americans changed their attitude towards the Secretariat. The sixth conference held in Paris in 1909 thus had a larger attendance than all the preceding ones and marked a definite step in advance in the life of the organization. The struggle for shaping the International Secretariat was not ended, however. It was merely changed in character, and now centered around two issues. The French delegates demanded the holding of general international trade union congresses at which political and social, as well as trade union, questions should be considered. The American delegates criticized the name "secretariat" as meaning nothing to American workers and demanded that the International Secretariat should be reorganized into an International Federation of Trade Unions.

These two demands occupied much of the time of the three conferences held in 1909 in Paris, in 1911 in Budapest, and in 1912 in Zurich. The French proposal was consistently voted down by the majority of delegates as an attempt to drive a wedge between the socialist parties and the trade unions. The American proposal met with greater consideration. At the Budapest conference, a committee was appointed to report on it, and in 1913, at Zurich,

the International Secretariat was renamed the International Federation of Trade Unions.

This change in name did not signify, however, a change in essence. The International Federation was to be governed, like the International Secretariat, not by any formal constitution, but by special resolutions passed as occasion arose. From 1901 to 1913, the chief rules which guided the Secretariat in matters of organization were that only one national trade union center was to be admitted from each country and that "every country was to be free to determine its own tendency and tactics."

3. Statistics and Strike Aid

Regardless of the friction described, the International Secretariat made steady progress. The countries affiliated rose from eight, in 1901, to 19, in 1913. The affiliated membership which was 2,168,000 in 1904 increased to 4,242,000 in 1909, and to 7,394,000 in 1913. A nucleus of steady members paying dues regularly was formed in England, Germany, Austria, Sweden, Norway, Denmark, Italy, Holland, France, and the United States. Dues were raised several times, from 12 to 25 cents per thousand members per year in 1905, to 37 cents in 1907 and to about a dollar per thousand members in 1913. Accordingly, the annual budget of the Secretariat grew. It was about \$260 in 1903-4; \$270 in 1904-5; about \$530 in 1905-6; about \$2,100 in 1911-12; and

\$1,720 in 1912-13. In 1909, a paid assistant secretary was engaged, and by 1914 the Secretariat was employing twelve persons: four Englishmen, four French-Swiss, one American, one Dane, and two Germans.

The chief function which the International Secretariat set itself was to collect and distribute information. Carl Legien, known as the "statistician of the German labor movement," waged a long campaign with the national centers and with the International Trade Secretariats for improved make-up and for wider distribution and utilization of reports. Legien modeled his reports after the German pattern. Beginning with the first year of publication, 1903, these reports were published in book form in German, French, and English, under the title of "International Reports on the Trade Union Movement." They recounted the numerical strength of the trade unions, financial resources and expenditures, numbers engaged in industrial disputes or locked out, statistics of strikes won, lost, or settled, accounts of legislative work, the minutes of the proceedings of the international conferences, and addresses of trade unions in different countries. The most comprehensive data were given for Germany; the information on other countries differing in scope and accuracy.

In 1909, at the suggestion of the Dutch, it was decided to publish a bi-monthly news-letter in three

languages. The first issue did not appear, however, until January 1, 1913.

Next to the collection of information, the most important effort of the International Secretariat was rendering strike aid. Between 1909 and 1913, the Secretariat was instrumental in collecting about \$700,000. The bulk of this amount, over \$643,000, was collected in 1909 for the Swedish lock-out which developed into a general strike.⁴ At the Budapest conference in 1911, the Croatian national center proposed the creation of an international strike fund, but the proposal was rejected because "international relations were neither sufficiently clear nor developed." However, more definite rules as to the conditions under which international aid was to be rendered were adopted, and it was decided that all collections were to be made by and through the International Secretariat only. In these collections, Germany and the Scandinavian countries were the best givers; England, France, and the United States the least responsive.

Another form of strike aid which the International Secretariat tried to render was the prevention of strike-breaking. In contrast to conditions during the period of the First International when the Brit-

⁴ The other collections were as follows: \$8,895 for a lock-out in Norway in 1911; \$24,137 for the London dock strikers in 1911; \$7,080 for general relief in Serbia and Bulgaria in 1912; \$2,525 for the Belgian general strike in 1913; \$11,899 for striking factory workers of Holland in 1913; and \$2,061 in 1913 for trade union work in Italy.

ish trade unions had to cope with the competition of the unorganized workers of the Continent, it was now the turn of the workers of Germany and of other Continental countries to view with alarm the menace of British casual labor, a houseless, mobile element uncontrolled by organization which was being used for strike-breaking purposes on the Continent. The International Secretariat did not feel quite equal to the task, and at the Christiania conference in 1907, after a confidential debate, it was resolved to instruct the representatives of labor in the parliaments of the different countries to strive for laws which would prohibit the import and export of "scab" labor. The Budapest conference in 1911 passed a motion offered by the American delegates in favor of the suspension of immigration during strikes and trade depressions.

Aside from this, the International Secretariat tried to focus attention, though not very effectively, on a number of other problems which affected labor internationally. Thus, the Christiania conference in 1907, considered the question of an international campaign in favor of the so-called Bern conventions prohibiting the use of industrial poisons and regulating night and home work. The same conference concerned itself with the question of the transfer of members of unions in one country to unions of another country. This latter question turned particularly upon complaints against the British trade unions which refused to accept immigrant workers

who had been members of unions in their home country and treated them as unorganized workers. This was contrary to the practice of almost all trade unions on the Continent of Europe, which transferred members from the unions of one country to those of another free of charge. The Christiania conference of 1907 wanted to make it mandatory upon the unions of all national centers to receive members of similar organizations abroad, but as the conference lacked coercive power, it finally contented itself with an expression of an opinion in favor of such action. Such expression of opinion, however, did not open the doors of the autonomous British trade unions to foreign workers. Appleton, the president of the British Federation of Trade Unions, could report but little progress in this respect at later conferences and urged that this question be left to direct agreements between the trade unions of different countries.

4. International Letter Box

To sum up, from 1904 to 1914, the International Secretariat was slowly feeling its way towards a larger field of activity. From a conference of a few officials it expanded to include duly elected delegates; it set up a permanent bureau which was manned by a staff of trained employees. It changed its name to that of International Federation of Trade Unions to indicate the larger basis of organization to which it was passing. It built up the first body of international trade union statistics and

THE INTERNATIONAL LABOR SECRETARIATS

I. Trade Secretariats in 1911, Membership and Income ^a

Trade Secretariat	Membership	Income
Miners.....	320,600	\$902
Wood workers.....	418,590	2,375
Building workers.....		
Painters.....	45,000	569
Stone workers.....	970,420	...
Metal workers.....		
Textile workers.....	30,200	1,155
Hatters.....	6,400	2,166
Furriers.....	64,400	608
Leather and shoe workers.....	18,567	57
Saddlers.....	101,500	474
Tailors.....	63,187	2,713
Bakers.....	118,681	...
Brewery workers.....	50,125	2,582
Tobacco workers.....	134,700	24,308
Printers.....	34,260	1,956
Lithographers.....	46,588	184
Bookbinders.....	4,100	125
Hairdressers.....	28,129	124
Hotel workers.....	42,450	...
Glass workers.....	36,050	1,559
Pottery workers.....	267,052	454
Factory workers.....	821,816	...
Transport workers.....	64,786	377
Municipal workers.....
Clerical employees.....
Diamond workers.....

II. The Secretariat of National Trade Union Centers

Principal Countries	Number Affiliated ^b		
	1912-13	1908-09	1904-05
Total number of national Trade Union Centers.....	19	18	15
Total membership.....	7,394,461	4,242,000	2,168,898
Germany.....	2,530,000	1,831,000	887,600
United States.....	1,943,000		
England ^c	900,000	695,000	400,000
Austria.....	428,000	480,000	204,000
France.....	387,000	320,000	320,000
Italy.....	275,000	250,000	...
Sweden.....	85,000	170,000	81,000
Norway.....	61,000	46,000	11,000
Denmark.....	105,000	96,000	68,000
Belgium.....	116,000	67,000	20,000
Holland.....	61,500	37,000	10,000
Hungary.....	95,000	130,000	50,000
Switzerland.....	65,000	50,000	30,000
Spain.....	100,000	34,000	79,600

^a The figures in these two tables are from the annual reports published by the International Secretariat for 1903-1913. Income figures have been converted to United States dollars.

^b The membership of the separate countries given here was that used as a basis for computing dues. It should be borne in mind that in most countries there were other labor unions with a considerable membership which for one reason or another would not affiliate with the International Secretariat.

^c The English organization affiliated was the General Federation of Trade Unions which was organized in 1899 chiefly for mutual assistance in strikes. It should be distinguished from the British Trade Union Congress which set itself larger economic and social aims.

brought about a better acquaintance between the labor leaders of the principal industrial countries. In the year before the war, it was getting into contact with Argentina, South Africa, and Australia. In the same year it also made the first step towards the establishment of regular relations with the Trade Secretariats.⁵

All this work was slow and unobtrusive and offered little to the dramatic imagination. To those who thought of internationalism in large terms, the International Secretariat, which refused to consider large political and social problems, was nothing but an "international letter-box."

5. German Leadership

The International Secretariat and the Trade Secretariats before 1914 were clearly under German influence. This was no accident. The German trade unions did most to promote international trade unionism and had most to gain from it. As a rapidly developing industrial country during this period, Germany drew labor from all sides. Migratory craftsmen from Scandinavia, France, Italy, Switzerland, Austria, and Holland streamed into Germany in search of training and of seasonal work, while unskilled and unorganized laborers came from

⁵ This was done by Legien, who invited the secretaries of the Trade Secretariats to the Zurich conference of the International Secretariat as guests. After the close of the conference, Legien arranged a meeting of the officials of the Trade Secretariats to which the delegates of the International Secretariat came as guests. This procedure was to be continued in the future.

the hinterland of Southern and Eastern Europe. The German trade unionists endeavored to cope with this immigration in various ways; where the entering workers were organized at home, they regulated the exchange and transfer of members; where they were unorganized, the Germans undertook to promote organization, often without formalities, simply sending organizers and money into the foreign country. But as such informality was not always possible or convenient, they took the initiative in creating the mechanism of international organization described in this chapter. In this, they had the support of other countries of Central Europe, and of the Scandinavian countries which felt the need of international aid because of the limitations of their own trade union resources.

On the other hand, during this period, the British trade unions were but little interested in things Continental. British workmen during these years did not travel, migration from Great Britain went overseas, foreign workers were not important in the industrial life of England, and the international competition to British goods was as yet no factor in the minds of the British workers. The Federation of British Trade Unions, therefore, played but a passive part in the International Secretariat, and the British trade unions which joined the Trade Secretariats were but mildly interested in their proceedings. The Germans regarded the British trade unions as a drag on their international efforts and

frequently criticized the British trade unionists for their inertia and insularity, for their refusal to admit foreign workers free, for balking at international levies, and for their failure to contribute to relief funds in proportion to their strength.

German leadership in the International Secretariat was disputed only by the French Confederation of Labor and by the American Federation of Labor. But French syndicalism, fostered by the peculiar industrial and political conditions of France, was too weak in organization, too exotic in spirit, and too violently anti-socialist to play a leading part in the European trade union movement.⁶ Neither was American organized labor in a position to assume leadership against the Germans, as is made clear in the chapter which follows.

III. OTHER ORGANIZATIONS

1. The International Labor Office

As indicated above, the International Secretariat of Trade Union Centers had some points of contact with the International Association for Labor Legislation. The latter, organized in 1900, was the culmination of the movement to promote the legal regulation of labor conditions by international agreements, inaugurated by Le Grand.⁷ The International Association for Labor Legislation

⁶ The French trade unionists complained on occasions that they were treated by the Germans "as if they were children." The disagreements described occurred also in some of the International Trade Secretariats.

⁷ See Chapter I, p. 20, and Chapter III, pp. 70-71.

was in no sense a labor organization, its national and local sections drawing their membership from all classes of the community. The International Labor Office which the International Association for Labor Legislation maintained in Basel, was a semi-official agency supported in part by governmental subsidies.⁸ Some national sections, however, carried on their work in close contact with the labor unions.⁹ Through the work of the International Labor Office in Basel, the beginnings in international labor legislation made before 1914, such as the Bern convention on the use of industrial poisons and the special labor treaties between France, Italy, Germany, and other countries, were brought within the ken of international trade unionism.

2. The Christian International

An incipient opposition to the International Secretariat of Trade Union Centers was attempted on the eve of the World War by the growing Christian trade unions. The impulse to organize such unions was given by Pope Leo XIII in 1891, by his Encyclical "De Rerum Novarum," though some feeble beginnings may be traced before that date. After 1891, Christian trade unions, composed almost entirely of Catholic workers, were organized in Germany, Austria, Belgium, Holland, Switzerland, and

⁸ The American government appropriated 200 dollars a year for this office from 1903 to 1909. In 1910, the appropriation was increased to 1,000 dollars.

⁹ Such was the case of the American Association for Labor Legislation organized in 1906, which was a member of the International Association.

Italy. In 1900, a group of textile workers from Holland, Belgium, and Germany held a conference at Aix-la-Chapelle and agreed to support each other in their work. In a few other trades, such as shoemaking and woodworking, the Christian trade unions of various countries agreed to visit each others' congresses, but no formal organizations were set up.

In 1908, after four years of preparation, an international conference of Christian trade unions met at Zurich and formed an International Secretariat of Christian Trade Unions. Germany, Italy, Switzerland, Sweden, Russia, Austria, Holland, Belgium were represented, Germany being far ahead of the others in organization. Dispute arose over the question of confining affiliation to Catholic unions, but the attempt of certain Dutch Bishops to effect such limitations was resented, and the federation was voted inter-denominational. The conference appointed A. Stegerwald, of Germany, international secretary, with headquarters at Cologne, and a Commission consisting of one member from each affiliated organization, was elected.

Before the war, the Christian International claimed a membership of 542,213, two-thirds of which was located in Germany, and the rest scattered in Austria, Belgium, Holland, Switzerland, and Italy. But it had a merely nominal existence and was completely ignored by the International Secretariat of National Trade Union Centers.

CHAPTER V

AMERICAN-EUROPEAN LABOR RELATIONS, 1881-1914

American participation in the pre-war international labor movement has been touched upon in the preceding chapters. But a clearer picture of it is necessary for an understanding of what was to come after 1914.

I. HANDS ACROSS THE SEAS

When the Federation of Organized Trades and Labor Unions, the forerunner of the American Federation of Labor, was organized in 1881, it found the tradition of international relations which had been established by the National Labor Union.¹ The Federation associated itself with this tradition at once. At its opening convention in 1881, it exchanged "fraternal greetings" with the Parliamentary Committee of the British Trade Union Congress, through the latter's secretary, Henry Broadhurst. In 1883, it entered into relations with French trade unions through a delegation which was sent on a visit to America by the municipality of Paris, and began a correspondence with the Socialist Workingmen's League of France relative to a pro-

¹ See Chapter II, pp. 47-48.

jected Workingmen's International Exposition in Paris and a somewhat hazy proposal for a "universal federation."

When the American Federation of Labor was launched in 1886, contacts had thus already been made with Europe. Because of the interest which the A. F. of L. was showing in tying up with the trade unions of Europe, it was invited to the international conferences which met in Paris in 1889.² As described elsewhere, the A. F. of L., though too poor to send a delegate, influenced the work of these congresses indirectly, being responsible for the launching of International May Day.³

II. GOMPERS AND THE SECOND INTERNATIONAL

Spurred on by the international congresses which were being held in Europe, Gompers put forth the plan of calling an international congress of trade unions at Chicago in 1893, coincident with the World's Fair. With the endorsement of the A. F. of L. convention of 1889, Gompers issued invitations to "the organized wage workers of the world" urging that no other international labor congress be held that year. In 1890, he wanted the A. F. of L. to push the scheme by sending a delegate to the international socialist congress of Brussels, but the A. F. of L. was unwilling. The following year, the con-

² See Chapter III, p. 71.

³ The A. F. of L. soon after dissociated itself from the idea of May Day and promoted the legal institution of Labor Day in September.

vention of the A. F. of L. showed more enthusiasm for the idea and decided to send delegates to France, England, and Germany to arouse interest in the plan. For some reason, however, most likely for lack of funds, the delegates were not sent, and as the written invitations which were sent out brought the acceptance only of the British Trade Union Congress, the project was called off by the A. F. of L. in 1892.

Gompers attributed the meagre response of Europe to distance, to lack of personal advocacy, and to the "malicious" influence of the Socialist Labor Party of America. It was in 1890 that the A. F. of L. had refused a charter to the New York Central Labor Federation because the latter included a section of the Socialist Labor Party, and the American socialists opened a campaign against the A. F. of L. Gompers attempted to justify the action of the A. F. of L. in an account sent first to Friedrich Engels and then to F. A. Sorge, but the European socialists sided with the Socialist Labor Party of America. The International Socialist Congress of Brussels of 1891 declined Gompers' invitation to come to Chicago in 1893, and Gompers ascribed this act to the "misrepresentation of the character of the American Federation of Labor by one who was excluded" from the convention of the A. F. of L. in 1890, namely Lucien Sanial, the American delegate to the Brussels congress.

This incident was the spark which exploded the

hostility of Gompers and of the A. F. of L. to the Second International. From that time on, Gompers began to draw a sharp line between the trade union and the socialist movements, and he became eager to establish a purely trade union international organization, distinct from, if not in opposition to, the Socialist International.⁴

Gompers tried to enlist the British trade unions in his enterprise. In 1894, the A. F. of L. inaugurated an exchange of "fraternal delegates" with the British Trade Union Congress. John Burns came to the convention of the A. F. of L. that year, while the following year Gompers and McGuire were sent as delegates to the British Trade Union Congress.⁵ In 1896, American fraternal delegates were again sent to the British Trade Union Congress, where they suggested the convening of "a bona fide trade union congress" in the hope that the British would take the initiative. The proposal, however, failed to find support in England and had to be dropped.

⁴ Gompers' suspicion and dislike of the leaders of the Second International were strengthened by the letters which he received from his confidential correspondents abroad. Thus, after the Brussels congress of the Second International, Gompers received a report from Victor de la Haye which read in part: "The bulk of the delegates [to the Brussels congress] were economic and philosophic Utopians, all agitating social principles of an abstract and preconceived character, and political questions instead of immediate reforms to better the workmen's condition."

⁵ Gompers was defeated for the presidency of the A. F. of L. that year. His trip to Europe was extended so as to include visits, not only to London, Manchester, and Liverpool, but also to Dublin, Paris, Hamburg, and Amsterdam. Gompers' allowance for the trip was \$225.

III. CORRESPONDENCE AND COLLECTIONS

In spite of these disappointments, Gompers continued to take an interest in projects of international trade unionism^o and tried consistently to develop more regular contacts and a better mutual knowledge between the labor organizations of Europe and America. How slight communications were in those days may be attested by a few incidents. In 1893, Tom Mann inquired of Gompers whether he was a native American. In 1894, he wrote again to find out if the American Federation of Labor was backing the Railwaymen's Strike. In general, requests which came to Gompers in those days for information show ignorance or inability to obtain, abroad, information on the most elementary facts of the American labor movement such as the number of trade unions, the constitution and rules of the A. F. of L., the events of the chief industrial struggles. The publication and exchange of labor periodicals was negligible, and Gompers in his turn had to rely for information on conditions abroad on the general newspapers and on whatever documents were sent to him voluntarily, of which the chief and best at that time was the *Correspondenzblatt*, published by Legien.

To supplement this, Gompers kept up a large, and often intimate, correspondence with leading trade

^o In 1896-7, Gompers took an active part in the movement to organize an international union of seamen and dockers which had been started by Tom Mann and Ben Tillett.

unionists abroad. In 1894, he began the publication of the *American Federationist*, which became a regular means of contact between the A. F. of L. and the trade unionists of Europe. From 1894 on, a better mutual acquaintance was fostered also through the exchange of fraternal delegates with England.

During these years at least two cases are on record in which American labor responded to appeals for financial aid from workers abroad. One was in 1891, when the A. F. of L. loaned \$500 and several thousand dollars were collected in America for the typographical workers of Germany who were on strike for a nine-hour day. The other was in 1897, in connection with the great lockout in the engineering trades in England. Gompers had at first refrained from issuing an appeal for aid because of the prolonged depression in America, the drain on the resources of American unions as a result of the miners' strike of that year, and because of the friction between the machinists' union in America and the Amalgamated Society of Engineers in England due to the latter's persistence in maintaining branches of its organization in the United States. The 1897 convention of the A. F. of L., however, resolved that "none of us can afford to ignore the importance, the world over, of the present attack on the Amalgamated Society of Engineers, and as an expression of our practical sympathy we recommend that the President be instructed to issue an urgent appeal to the affiliated bodies for a subscription on

behalf of the engineers and that the American Federation of Labor head the list with a subscription of \$500." In response to this appeal, \$11,144 was collected.

IV. THE TURN IN THE ROAD

In contrast to the ten years from 1889 to 1898, the following five years witnessed a slump in the interest of the A. F. of L. in international contacts. These were years when the A. F. of L. was growing rapidly, its component unions were waging big strikes, and domestic affairs were absorbing all the energies of the A. F. of L. leadership. Besides, these were also years when the Second International was looming up on the international horizon of labor, and the A. F. of L. was unwilling to join it and could do nothing to counteract its influence.

After 1904, however, the A. F. of L. began to be drawn into more definite and regular relations with the labor movements of Europe. This was due to three influences: the increasing immigration of skilled and unskilled labor into America and the failure of the A. F. of L. to obtain restrictive immigration laws; the growth of the purely trade union Internationals described in the preceding chapter; and the growing interest everywhere in the problem of maintaining peace. Gompers developed a special interest in the peace movement and brought the subject within the realm of interest of the A. F. of L. Already in 1899, as a result of the Spanish-American

War, he made the first references in his annual report to international peace as the "mission of organized labor." In his report to the convention of 1900, he claimed that "the preservation of the peace of the world devolved more and more upon organized labor," while at the convention of 1904, he claimed that it had been his aim "to stimulate to the fullest the very best spirit and conception of brotherhood among the workers of the world." Speaking for the A. F. of L., Gompers welcomed the establishment of the Hague Court and the arbitration treaties between the United States and several foreign governments.

In Gompers' mind, the idea of international peace became combined with the idea which he had cherished since 1889 of an international federation of labor. At the convention of the A. F. of L. in 1907, he pointed out that the Hague conference had had but meager results, and concluded that international peace could come sooner and would be more lasting as the result of the growth of the international trade union movement than through the establishment of an international court with no power to enforce decisions. "It must never be forgotten," he said then, "that in the last analysis the masses of the people of every country have it in their hands to exert their own giant will and power against international war, and that if otherwise thwarted they will not hesitate to exert it." His ideas and sentiments were endorsed by the convention.

Under these influences and spurred on by Gompers, the A. F. of L. took a more active interest after 1904 in matters of international labor relations. First among the measures which were recommended to American trade unionists for establishing amicable relations with labor abroad was the free interchange of union cards. At the convention of the A. F. of L. in 1905, Gompers expressed his gratification that American unions were accepting for membership, without initiation fees, workers coming from abroad, and declared that "this principle should become general and reciprocal," as it could do more "than all else to establish the Brotherhood and Solidarity of the toilers everywhere." The convention instructed the Executive Council to enter into communication with unions at home and abroad for the purpose of encouraging the practice. Though on account of its form of organization, the A. F. of L. could not force its affiliated unions, it continued to urge upon them a "policy of liberality and fraternity" in this regard.

Another policy, in fulfillment of the same ends, which was now taken up, was that of bringing American trade unions into closer relations with the Trade Secretariats. The offices of the A. F. of L. and of Gompers personally were used to induce American unions to attend the international conferences of their respective trades. Though these efforts were not always successful, they were partly responsible for the fact that between 1904 and

1909, the American unions of miners, moulders, painters, shoemakers, lithographers, bakers, and brewers became members of their respective International Trade Secretariats.

The supreme international effort of the A. F. of L. during this period, however, was its affiliation with the International Secretariat of National Trade Union Centers and its attempt to form an International Federation of Labor. After repeated invitations between 1905 and 1908,⁷ Gompers wrote to Legien that the Denver convention of the A. F. of L. in 1908 had elected him delegate to the coming conference of the International Secretariat. To suit the convenience of the American delegates, the conference which had been fixed for 1910 in Vienna was shifted to 1909, and the place to Paris.

In attending the Paris conference of 1909, Gompers had two aims in view. He wanted to counteract the unfavorable reports of the American labor movement which were current in Europe, especially in socialist circles. On March 13, 1909, he wrote to Legien: "The labor movement of the United States is one peculiarly its own and conforming to American conditions, and an opportunity to understand them thoroughly would undoubtedly be helpful to all." And he was eager to advance the idea of an International Federation of Labor, provided that the A. F. of L., on joining such an international organization, would still be free to pursue its own

⁷ See Chapter IV, pp. 103-104.

course. Gompers obtained the support of the A. F. of L. for his scheme, and on June 9, 1909, the Executive Council of the A. F. of L. voted a resolution to be submitted to the Paris conference recommending to the trade union centers of all countries the discussion of a proposition establishing an International Federation of Trade Unions.

Gompers' reception at the Paris conference was not entirely friendly. His speech in which he told the conference that he had come, not as a delegate, but as an observer, and that the A. F. of L. would not join unless allowed to go its own way, aroused much irritation. Certain delegates, especially the secretary of the Austrian trade unions, Hueber, were openly hostile. "I am not surprised at Gompers' speech," said Hueber, "which means briefly that Gompers does not desire the union of the proletariat of the two hemispheres." A confidential correspondent of Gompers wrote to him, after his return to America, that many of the "radicals" would gladly prevent the affiliation of the A. F. of L., if they could.

In his turn, Gompers was far from pleased with what he saw at the Paris conference. Its composition was not such as to suit his idea of a trade union gathering. Huysmans, the Belgian delegate, was a professor and, worse still, the secretary of the International Socialist Bureau. The French Confederation of Labor was represented by two "anarchists," George Yvetot and Leon Jouhaux. The Austrian and Dutch delegates, Hueber and Jan Oudegeest,

were "wholly socialistic and denounced true trade unionism." Far too much time was spent in general discussion, and too little in practical work.

But Gompers decided to overlook all this, because the Paris conference met his wishes on the main points. It declared that labor in every country must be free to decide its own policy and methods, and it adopted a provision that all decisions of the international conference must be unanimous in order to be binding. In view of this, Gompers on his return to America, urged the A. F. of L. to affiliate with the International Secretariat. In his report to the 1909 convention of the A. F. of L., he said: "I am fully persuaded and have no hesitancy in recommending that though the International Secretariat leaves much to be desired, yet the best interests of the workers of America will be served by our adherence thereto. Financially, the costs would be but small, the substantial benefits would of necessity be exceedingly meager, yet the spirit of international fraternity would be immeasurable. Our adherence would hasten the establishment of an International Federation of Labor." The convention voted to adhere, and in 1910 the American Federation of Labor became a member of the International Secretariat.

V. AMERICA'S PART

At the international conference of Budapest in 1911, the A. F. of L. had to defend its position in the International Secretariat against two attacks. On

the one hand, the Industrial Workers of the World brought in a demand, through William Z. Foster, to expel the A. F. of L. in favor of themselves, on the ground that the A. F. of L. was connected with the National Civic Federation and was thus unfit to conduct a true working-class struggle. The case of the A. F. of L. was presented by its delegate, vice-president James Duncan. The French delegates, Yvetot and Jouhaux, supported the claim of the I. W. W., but they were alone in this endeavor. After a debate which consumed a whole day, the A. F. of L. won, and the I. W. W. were not admitted to the conference.

On the other hand, the Canadian Trades and Labor Congress was invited by Legien to send a delegate to Budapest, provided that it were recognized as a distinct national center. The Canadians consulted the Executive Council of the A. F. of L. As a matter of fact, each national center was entitled to send two delegates to an international conference, but the A. F. of L. did not care to incur the expense and it objected to having the Canadian organization send its own delegate. The Executive Council of the A. F. of L. expressed this point of view as follows: "We insist upon maintaining our position that the delegate from the A. F. of L. shall be the delegate representing the American labor movement of which the Canadian Trades and Labor Congress is a component part." The Budapest conference left the matter open for further consideration.

At Budapest, the A. F. of L. made its influence felt in several ways. It opposed the proposals of the French Confederation of Labor on anti-militarism, anti-patriotism and the general strike. It disapproved the Croatian proposal for an international strike fund on the grounds that such a fund would be too great a drain on the resources of the larger countries and that the labor organizations of all countries should learn to rely on themselves primarily. It voted against the proposal to hold the conference of the International Secretariat every three years, coincidentally with the International Socialist Congresses. It put forth three proposals of its own. One was that all means should be taken to prevent the exportation of strike-breakers and to stop immigration in times of industrial disputes. A second provided that if the International Secretariat received a document assailing a national center, that document should be forwarded first to the center in question, and if valid objection to its dissemination be raised, the document should be held over until the next conference.⁸ The third was for the establishment of an International Federation of Trade Unions. The first two proposals were carried by the Budapest conference. The third was referred to the national trade union centers for discussion.

⁸ This proposal was occasioned by the "scurrilous" accusations of the I. W. W. against the A. F. of L. which were allowed to be circulated without giving the A. F. of L. a chance to reply first.

At the international conference of Zurich in 1913, the A. F. of L. was represented by George W. Perkins, president of the cigarmakers' union. Here again the A. F. of L. successfully opposed the application of the Canadian Trades and Labor Congress for independent representation. The main achievement of the A. F. of L. at this conference was the adoption of its proposal for changing the name of the International Secretariat to that of International Federation of Trade Unions. In general, the Zurich conference showed that the trade unionists of Europe were anxious to cement their relations with America. The delegates accepted the invitation extended by Perkins to hold the next international conference in San Francisco, at the time of the opening of the Panama Canal, though the expense involved was far beyond the means of many of the affiliated organizations. To meet the wishes of the Americans, it was arranged to share expenses so that the larger countries might carry the smaller ones, and the A. F. of L. agreed to contribute \$2,000 towards the cost.

From the date of affiliation to the outbreak of the War, the A. F. of L. and the International Secretariat exchanged a lively correspondence. All appeals, reports, and general communications of the International Secretariat were sent to the American center. On several occasions, appeals for aid to strikers in different countries, as in the case of the Swedish general strike in 1909 and during the Lon-

don dockers' strike in 1911-12, were circulated among the American trade unions.⁹ From time to time, the A. F. of L. addressed inquiries to the International Secretariat as, for instance, in May 1913, on wages and conditions in the Dusseldorf-Neuss plant of the International Harvester Company, because of a rumor that on account of labor trouble the company was considering moving its entire business to Germany. The dues which the A. F. of L. paid to the International Secretariat were small; they amounted to \$560 for 1909-10; to \$600 for 1910-11; to \$635 for 1911-12; and to \$1,947 for 1913-14.

With these growing contacts grew also Gompers' ambition to make the American Federation of Labor a greater factor in international affairs. This was evidenced especially by two acts of the A. F. of L. convention of 1913. One was the appointment by that convention of a standing committee on international relations. The other was a resolution endorsing the proposal of Winston Churchill for a "naval holiday" between England, Germany, and the United States. In pursuance of this resolution, Gompers wrote to Legien asking that the International Secretariat submit the proposal to the affiliated trade union centers and urge them to support it. Legien declined to circulate such an appeal. Legien argued that the International Secretariat had refused to deal with similar questions when submitted

⁹ Over \$46,000 were collected in the United States for the Swedish general strike.

by the French Confederation of Labor in 1904 and 1907, that discussions of such questions would endanger the unity of the trade union movement, and that some trade unions were prohibited by the laws of their country from passing upon such questions. Gompers was greatly disappointed by Legien's reply. He sent out the appeal on his own initiative, but it brought no favorable response.

On the eve of the World War, American labor was thus becoming an active member of the international labor movement. Several important trade unions belonged to their International Trade Secretariats, while the A. F. of L. was taking a growing interest in the International Secretariat. Though the economic and spiritual ties were too tenuous to withstand the strain of a crisis, these pre-war contacts gave American labor a vantage point for the part which it was to play during and immediately after the World War.

CHAPTER VI

THE GREAT FAILURE

On the eve of the World War, the international labor and socialist movement could look back upon a decade and a half of steady progress. International Trade Secretariats had laid the basis for an international consciousness of craft. An International Federation of Trade Unions was reaching out for a larger program of trade union action. Owing to the International Association for Labor Legislation, a beginning had been made in the regulation of labor conditions by agreements between governments. And towering above the others was the Second International with 12 million followers in 27 socialist parties in 22 countries ¹ which claimed to symbolize the international solidarity of labor in the widest sense of the term.

¹ Socialist membership in the principal countries of the world, just before the war, was as follows: 1,085,000 in Germany; 145,500 in Austria; 144,000 in Czechoslovakia; 93,500 in the United States; 80,300 in France; 61,000 in Hungary; 50,000 in Italy; 33,200 in Switzerland. The largest socialist votes were: 4,250,000 in Germany in 1912; 1,400,000 in France in 1914; 1,041,000 in Austria in 1907; 960,000 in Italy in 1913; 901,000 in the United States in 1912; 600,000 in Belgium; 310,000 in Finland; 265,000 in Sweden; 40,000 in Argentina; and over a million for labor parties in Australia.

Underlying this movement was an axiomatic opposition to war which epitomized the fundamental concepts of socialism. War was regarded as inherent in capitalism, and it was an uncontested article of socialist faith that the workers should not fight the battles of the capitalists.

In the Second International especially, there was a strong belief that its very existence was a guarantee against the menace of war. This was an obvious contradiction. At one and the same time it was held that war was inevitable, and that the socialists and organized labor could prevent it. There were two possible ways out of the difficulty. One was to admit that "capitalism" could be reformed and made to follow peaceful policies; the other was to accept the idea, current in some socialist circles, that a general war could be turned into a general revolution which would put an end to capitalism itself.²

Both ways were taken by different elements of the Second International. This division of opinion cut across national lines and became complicated by disagreement on other basic problems of labor and social policy.

Instead of facing these divisions, the Second International tried to maintain a balance between

² Marx and Engels on several occasions had prophesied that a "guerre universelle" or "guerre generale" would release a general revolutionary struggle. Bakunin, disillusioned towards the end of his life because of "the lack of revolutionary ideas and passions among the people," found consolation in the idea that a "social revolution" would come some day as a result of a world war. Similar ideas were expressed by Bebel and Kautsky.

them. Its final resolution on war, which was to guide its members in a crisis, was a compromise couched in vague words which left the future course of action uncertain.

I. THE TURN-ABOUT

The test came in July, 1914, with the Austro-Hungarian ultimatum to Serbia. The Second International tried to meet it by the devices which it had evolved. On July 29, 1914, while Austrian troops were moving on Belgrade, the International Socialist Bureau held an emergency session in Brussels to voice the workers' protest against the threatening general outbreak. The socialist leaders were still optimistic. They believed that the huge demonstrations which they were arranging in Germany, Austria, Italy, France, and Belgium would cause the governments to pause, and to take calmer council. In this faith, they moved up the congress which they had arranged to hold in Vienna on August 23, and at which the twenty-fifth anniversary of the Second International was to be celebrated, to August 9 and changed the place to Paris. Two days later, the German Socialist Party published a ringing manifesto urging the German government not to enter the "horrible war," and arranged huge peace meetings throughout Germany in which millions of workers took part.

On August 1, Germany declared war against Russia. The same day, Hermann Mueller was sent by

the German Social Democratic Party to Paris to agree with the French socialists upon a uniform procedure in parliament. It was thought that the course of events might be changed by the threat of German and French socialists to abstain from voting war credits. Mueller assured the French socialists that while the executive of the German Socialist Party had not as yet met to define its attitude, there could be no question of voting for war credits unless the whole situation had materially changed, and that the German socialists would either abstain or vote against. The French socialists, deprived at this critical moment of the leadership of Jaurès,³ dreading attack, and convinced that their government was doing its best to avert war, could not give a similar pledge. On August 4, Germany declared war on France, having already crossed the Belgian frontier.

At a joint meeting of the socialist members of the German Reichstag and of prominent members of the party, it was decided by 111 votes to 14 to vote for the war credits. Among those who voted in the negative were Karl Kautsky, Hugo Haase, Karl Liebknecht, Rosa Luxemburg and Franz Mehring. But in conformity with party discipline, this division of opinion was kept secret. At the Reichstag session of August 4, Haase read the party's unanimous public declaration, disclaiming responsibility for the imperialist policies preceding the war, condemning a war of

³ Jaurès was assassinated on July 31, 1914, by a Frenchman who was somewhat unbalanced by the war excitement.

conquest, recording the socialist demand for peace, at the same time accepting the "grim fact of war," and "refusing to leave the fatherland in the lurch" in the face of "the Russian peril and of the horrors of hostile invasion." The invasion of Belgium was not mentioned.

In the socialist and labor movements of the Allied countries, developments were more varied. In Belgium, the socialists and the trade unions allied themselves without a dissenting voice to the government of King Albert "for the defense of their country, of civilization, and of the freedom of the peoples of Europe." Emile Vandervelde, chairman of the International Socialist Bureau, became a Minister in the Belgian cabinet. In France, the "Union Sacrée" of all parties in defense of "la patrie" was proclaimed. Not only the socialists, but the syndicalists went over to the support of the government.

England showed a split. Prior to August 1, labor and the socialists denounced the British alliance with Russian autocracy. On August 1 and 2, huge "stop the war" meetings were arranged by the British socialists and by the Labor Party. After August 4, the Independent Labor Party and a few small radical socialistic groups continued to denounce the diplomats for bringing on the war. But the Labor Party and the Trade Union Congress gave their undivided support to the British government. The pacifist Ramsay MacDonald resigned

the chairmanship of the Labor Party and was succeeded by Arthur Henderson.

In Serbia, two Social Democrats voted in parliament against the war credits. Last, but not least, when the vote on war credits came up in the Russian Duma, 14 Russian Social Democrats, of the Bolshevik faction, declared that "the hearts of the Russian workers" were "with the European proletariat," that the war had been provoked by "a policy of expansion for which the ruling classes of all countries were responsible," and that "the terms of the peace" would be "dictated by the people themselves and not by diplomats." The Russian Bolsheviks then walked out of the Duma. Other socialist groups gave their support to the Russian government, though warning the latter that political and economic reforms were necessary.

With the exception of a few small groups, the socialists in the warring countries thus made a sudden and complete turn-about. The war which they denounced as a "universal imperialist aggression," in July, became converted in their minds in August into a war of general national defense. The German socialists endorsed national defense against Russia; the French and Belgian against Germany; and the English came to the defense of democracy and of the freedom of small nations—a sort of spiritual "patrie" which was adopted by all the Allied socialists. The Second International had failed.

II. THE QUESTION OF GUILT

The burden of the failure of the Second International has been laid by many on the socialists of Germany. In the words of an English socialist, the Germans "betrayed the entire socialist movement." "This accusation is based on the fact that the Germans played a dominant part in the Second International. They were regarded as the leaders of socialism in theory and practice, and "high regard" and "almost deference" was paid them in the International Socialist Bureau and at the congresses. With the help of the nationalities that invariably followed their lead, namely, Austria, Holland, the Scandinavian countries, the Germans could decide where and when international congresses should be held, predetermine the resolutions to be adopted, and influence the decisions of the Bureau.

German leadership in the Second International was a logical result of economic and social developments. As a rapidly growing industrial and imperial power, Germany during this period became interested in international problems. Germany's central position in Europe made her trade unions the leaders

⁴ Hyndman, *Evolution of Revolution*, p. 354. James Guillaume, a leading Swiss anarchist accused the German socialists of having been, from Marx down, disguised "Pan-Germanists" trying to use socialist internationalism to further the cause of a greater Germany. According to Samuel Gompers, the whole international socialist movement was promoted by Bismarck in anticipation of the coming World War as a means of undermining the morale in enemy countries. See Gompers, *Seventy Years of Life and Labor*, Vol. II, p. 388.

in international economic organization,⁵ while the German socialists found themselves in an analogous situation politically. For during the 25 years of the life of the Second International, Germany was in a way the dividing line between "Western democracy" and "Eastern autocracy." As a feudalistic industrialist monarchy, Germany was the scene of battle for political rights and social liberties which had already been won in the United States, England, and France, and which were entirely non-existent in Russia. In this struggle, the German socialists were much helped by the growth of socialist parties to the west and east of them. The spread of socialism in France and England meant that German socialists could hope to affect international policies more definitely, while the rise of a socialist movement in Russia minimized the fear of international complications to the east. It was because of these considerations that the German socialists actively promoted the Second International from its beginnings.

German leadership was also made inevitable by the incapacity or unwillingness of labor and socialist parties in other countries to assume the part. The United States was far away, and the American Socialist Party had no political power at home and little prestige abroad. The British Labor Party was a member of the Second International, but was not interested in taking an exacting and responsible part in it. France alone supplied during these years a

⁵ See Chapter IV, pp. 112-113.

significant opposition to German socialism in theory, in practice, and in leadership. The French socialist, Jaurès, was the outstanding and most influential person in the entire international socialist movement, and French syndicalism was the most influential doctrine of social revolution which rose in opposition to German Marxism. But the French socialists had no influence abroad. The socialists of the other important countries, such as Austria-Hungary, Switzerland, Holland, Sweden, Norway, Belgium, even Italy, regarded Germany as the land of a rising industrial power and of a high level of culture and looked upon the German socialists as the leaders of the economic and political international labor movement by the right of superior capacity and superior achievement. The leadership of German labor and of German socialism was thus but one aspect of the world influence which German thought in general was exercising at this time.

While inevitable, German leadership accentuated the inherent weakness of the Second International. For the German socialists, more than any other socialist party, were involved in profound internal contradictions. In the course of their national and international activities, the German socialists could not but become aware of the fact that their own successes were concomitant with the rise of the German Imperial State. However unfriendly their attitude towards the feudal, industrial, and monarchical rulers of their country was, they could not but feel

that in so far as the industrial development of the country was concerned there was a very definite identity of interests between them. To put it paradoxically, the prestige and success of German labor and of German socialism abroad were intertwined with, and dependent on, the success and prestige of the German Empire.

Another contradiction arose out of the successes of socialism and labor in Germany. The growth of the trade unions and of the political socialist party, the accumulation of funds, the development of a large apparatus of management, the network of newspapers and magazines, went hand in hand with the growth of an elaborate code of labor laws, with the upbuilding of sickness insurance funds, and of other schemes of social insurance—all of which meant that the workers were growing into the institutional life of the country and were acquiring an interest in its continued and smooth operation. From day to day, the German socialists pointed with pride to their achievements and to the progress made by the workers through their economic and political organizations. In their official program and in their theoretical statements, however, they continued to maintain that improvement under "capitalism" was impossible and that the overthrow of the capitalist system was the real goal of their activities. To put it again in the form of a paradox, the very successes of German labor and socialism in their opposition to the prevailing economic and political system made

them realize that they were an integral part of that national system.

A way out of these contradictions seemed possible through the path of Marxism, as interpreted by Kautsky. There were three elements in this doctrine which made it the most suitable philosophy of the socialist movement of this period. It was said to be a system of "scientific socialism." In an age in which science was acquiring great prestige, that was a source of gratification and pride. In addition to that, Marxism was a prediction that socialism was "inevitable" because it was inherent in the very development of capitalism. That was a source of comfort for it meant that history was working to give the socialists what they wanted. Marxism was vague about the time of the coming of the "social revolution" and yet held out the hope that it was not far off. Marx and Engels had several times changed the date of its coming: they had predicted it for 1848 and again for the end of the nineteenth century. But the German followers of Marx had gradually given up setting dates. That was a source of relief, for it meant that one could go about one's daily business in the confident expectation that history would do its part when it was ready. And lastly, Marxism had a vocabulary of the battle-field which was the heritage of the earlier socialist period. Its phraseology of "class struggle," "conquest of political power," "dictatorship of the proletariat," "historic mission of the working class" was tremendously

useful for agitation and propaganda among classes of workers who were new to industrialism, who had but recently emerged from feudalism and village subserviency, and who were only beginning to muster courage for political and economic self-assertion.

But instead of reconciling contradictions, Marxism aggravated them. Because of their Marxism, the German socialists assumed the part of an opposition party in the widest sense of the term. But because of the same Marxism, they failed to consider the possibility of passing from an attitude of opposition to one of responsibility. Their policies were negative. Socialists were not to enter "bourgeois" governments; they were not to vote military credits; they were not to assume responsibilities of government; they were also not to stir up revolution. As a result, the German socialists developed a psychology which was adjusted chiefly to a verbal opposition. The leaders made speeches and thundered their opposition to existing governments from the tribune of the Parliament and from the platforms of public meetings. The lesser leaders carried on a daily routine in which no suggestion of great mass movements could conveniently disturb their endeavors. But such psychology could not develop a capacity for quick decisions or large mass actions when emergencies arose.

To the extent to which the German socialists held out hope to their fellow socialists that the Second

International would prove adequate to its task, they laid themselves open to the blame for its failure. But the case of the German socialists was merely a phase of a general situation. The socialist parties of most other countries were caught in the same contradictions of national interests and international ideals. It was because of this that the Second International was condemned to a vacillating policy of compromise and to ultimate failure.

PART III

WAR AND REVOLUTION, 1914-1924

CHAPTER VII

THE ORIGIN OF THE THIRD INTERNATIONAL, 1914-1919

Before the World War was many weeks old, labor and socialist leaders in all the belligerent countries had called off the class struggle and had thrown themselves unconditionally into winning the war for their respective countries. The Second International, and the trade union Internationals proved incapable of anti-war action and broke down.

The collapse of these Internationals, however, was not the end of the international labor and socialist movement. Before the war was entirely over, the pre-war Internationals were reconstructed, and new Internationals were brought into being. The movement, in fact, assumed an amplitude unknown before, and for the first time became an important factor in world politics. These new developments were determined by the experiences of the war and by the idea of "world revolution" which the war stimulated. Because of this, the story of the international labor and socialist movement from 1914 to 1924 centers around the antithesis of war and revolution.

First in order is the story of the origin of the Third International. As the standard bearer of world revo-

lution, the Third International is the most characteristic product of the World War and bridges the workers' international movement of pre-war and post-war days.

I. RIGHT, CENTER, LEFT

As the turn of mind of the socialists in the warring countries became clear, an effort to bring the International Socialist Bureau into action was made by socialist parties of neutral countries. The most significant was that of the Italian and Swiss socialists. In Italy, the socialist party had reached a considerable development by 1914. It had a large membership, a strong group in parliament, and maintained close relations with the trade unions and the co-operatives.¹ It had an anti-war tradition. In 1912, it had opposed the Tripolitan War and had excluded from its ranks a group of "social reformers," under the leadership of Bissolati, who were in favor of that war. In June, 1914, it had staged a general strike which had threatened to develop into a revolution. Immediately after the outbreak of the war it had published a manifesto against all wars, and in favor of Italian neutrality in the World War.²

The Italian socialists thus felt that they were especially called upon to make a move on behalf of internationalism. In September, 1914, after the first

¹ Among the leaders of the Socialist Party of Italy were Turati, Morgari, Mussolini, Lazzari.

² Mussolini, then editor-in-chief of the Socialist official paper "Avanti," had a hand in drawing up this manifesto.

battle of the Marne, they called a joint conference with the Swiss socialists in Lugano.³ This conference declared that the war was "imperialist," that there were no "innocent governments," and demanded that the International Socialist Bureau be convened at once.

About the same time, the American Socialist Party issued an invitation for an international socialist conference in Washington. The socialist parties of Sweden, Norway, Denmark, and Holland met in Copenhagen in January, 1915, to consider peace terms on which the socialists of all countries might agree.

None of these efforts had the desired effect. Vandervelde refused the request of the Lugano conference. The office of the International Socialist Bureau was shortly afterwards removed by its secretary, Camille Huysmans, from Brussels to The Hague. This aroused the protest of the French socialists and further damaged the prestige of the Bureau. On the other hand, the attempt to lay down socialist peace terms merely accentuated the divisions between the socialists of the warring countries.

By the spring of 1915, the war temper of the labor and socialist organizations of the belligerent countries had considerably hardened. On both sides, labor and socialist leaders talked and wrote in terms which were aggressively nationalistic. In Germany,

³ Balabanoff, Angelica, *Memoirs of a Zimmerwaldian* (in Russian), Moscow, 1925.

socialist leaders like Paul Lensch, Eduard David, Südekum, Philipp Scheidemann, Gustav Noske, Friedrich Ebert, Wolfgang Heine told the German workers that their interests were identical with the interests of the German nation and of German Kultur and that a German victory would benefit the entire "international proletariat." In France and Belgium, Pierre Renaudel, A. Thomas and Vandervelde, were vehement in their denunciations of Germany. In England, the same rôle was played by H. G. Wells, Robert Blatchford, and H. M. Hyndman. These leaders represented what came to be known as the "Right" or "Majority" element of the socialist parties.

The "chauvinistic" and "imperialistic" declarations of the "Right" called forth the opposition of two groups which became known as the "Center" and the "Left." Among the leaders of the "Center" were Karl Kautsky, Eduard Bernstein, Hugo Haase, Arthur Crispian, and Georg Ledebour in Germany; Jean Longuet in France; Ramsay MacDonald in England. While admitting that the workers in each country had acted as was inevitable, these socialists claimed that it was necessary to maintain the general concept of a socialist internationalism above the din of the battlefield, in order that a socialist International may be reconstituted after the war. They opposed the unconditional voting of war budgets, and called for a statement of peace terms by their respective governments which would hasten the coming of peace. In the course of the summer of

1915, these socialists gained a sufficient following to form "minority" groups in Germany and France which tried to force the hands of the "majority."

On the other hand, radical "left" groups demanded more vigorous anti-war action. In Germany, Karl Liebknecht, Franz Mehring, Clara Zetkin, and Rosa Luxemburg, formed the group "L'Internationale" which denounced the "shameful failure" of the German Social-Democratic Party. In Austria, a small anti-war group was led by Friedrich Adler. Similar groups were led in France by Pierre Monatte and A. Merrheim; in England by the radicals of the Independent Labor Party; in Russian socialist circles by N. Lenin and L. Trotsky. The "left" groups insisted that the International Socialist Bureau be forced to take action. A few voices called for a "new International,"⁴ on the grounds that the Second International was already dead.

II. ZIMMERWALD

The initiative in opening up communications between these "minority" groups in the warring countries was taken by the Socialist Party of Italy on May 15, 1915.⁵ By this time the Italian socialists

⁴ Lenin was one of the first to make such statements, but he was not the only one. See A. Pannekoek in the *New Review* for February 1915; also Kossowsky, W., *Zur Wiederherstellung der Internationale*, *Neue Zeit*, May 21, 1915.

⁵ Before this, two attempts to bring together socialists of the warring countries had been made. In March, 1915, a conference of socialist women had been called in Bern by Clara Zetkin; in April, 1915, a conference of young socialists had been held, also in Bern.

had also become divided on the war. Some of the socialists and syndicalists in Italy had become converted to Italian participation in the war on the side of the Allies,⁶ but the party as a whole continued to oppose the war, even after Italy joined the Allies on May 23, 1915, and sought to rally all anti-war socialists for common action. In this it was supported by the Swiss socialists, especially by Robert Grimm, who "became for a while the center of all socialist anti-war negotiations."⁷

A conference of anti-war socialists was finally arranged in the little village of Zimmerwald, near Bern, in September, 1915. The call sent out by the Italian Socialist party was addressed to "all parties, workers' organizations, or groups which are known to have remained true to the old principles of the International and which are known to be willing to fight against the politics of civic peace and for the class struggle, and for the united action of socialists in all countries against war." In response to this call, unofficial delegates came from France and Germany; official delegates from three Russian socialist parties (Bolsheviks, Mensheviks, Left Social Revolutionists), from the Jewish Bund, from Poland, Rumania, Bulgaria, Italy, Switzerland, Hol-

⁶ Among these was Benito Mussolini, who was excluded from the Party in November, 1914.

⁷ Grimm, as well as the socialists of Italy, Holland, and Sweden, who were active in these negotiations, were accused of being "pro-German agents."

land, Sweden, and Norway.⁸ Altogether, 42 delegates gathered in a small, badly lighted room of a peasant house in Zimmerwald, and were in session from the 5th to the 12th of September.

Two manifestos were issued by the Zimmerwald conference. One, signed by the French and German delegates,⁹ declared: "This is not our war. . . . We pledge ourselves to tireless agitation for peace and to force our governments to stop this killing." The other, signed by all the delegates, placed the responsibility for the war on the governments, on secret diplomacy, employers' organizations, the capitalistic press, and the churches; rebuked the socialists of all countries for straying from their obligations and principles; and wound up with the slogan: "No annexations, no indemnities. Across frontiers, battlefields, devastated cities, and countries—Workers Unite!"¹⁰

Lenin, one of the delegates¹¹ at Zimmerwald, would have started a new International right there and then, to carry the slogan of revolution into the

⁸ The Independent Labor Party of England appointed delegates, but they were unable to obtain passports.

⁹ The French delegates were A. Bourderon, a member of the Socialist Party, and Alfred Merrheim, secretary of the Federation of Metal Workers. The German delegates were A. Hoffman, a deputy of the Prussian Landtag, and Georg Ledebour, a deputy of the Reichstag.

¹⁰ Zevaès, A., *Le Parti Socialiste*, p. 168.

¹¹ According to Zinoviev, Lenin was deeply affected by the war and developed a "concentrated, acute, and sharp hatred for the bourgeoisie" and for the "Right" socialists who failed to stop the war.

warring countries. But the majority of the delegates were primarily interested in bringing the war to an end and they hoped that the Second International could be galvanized into action. As a means to this end, they established an International Socialist Commission, which became known as the Zimmerwald Commission, to co-operate with the International Socialist Bureau, on behalf of a speedy peace.¹²

During the winter of 1915-16 the anti-war "minorities" in Germany and France separated themselves more clearly from the "majority" socialists. On December 15, 1915, the German "minority" socialists kicked over the traces of party discipline, declared Germany was in a position to offer peace, and cast 20 votes against the budget in the Reichstag. Twenty-four other socialists abstained from voting. As a result, Haase was deposed from the chairmanship of the Party. The "minority" socialists then formed a group of their own in the Reichstag. In France, Merrheim and Bourderon formed, in January, 1916, a "committee for the renewal of international relations" which carried on a secret propaganda in favor of the Zimmerwald resolutions. By the early months of 1916, Jean Longuet, leader of the moderate anti-war socialists in France, had gained the support of several large "federations"¹³ of the party and was demanding the calling of an interna-

¹² The Commission consisted of Robert Grimm and Charles Naine of Switzerland, Morgari and Angelica Balabanoff of Italy.

¹³ The French Socialist Party is divided into "federations"—one for each of the departments of France.

tional socialist conference for the discussion of peace. In Italy, the socialist party preached openly the Zimmerwald ideas. While in England, the Independent Labor Party approved the Zimmerwald resolutions and lent its support to purely pacifist organizations such as the Union for Democratic Control.

To promote further contacts between these groups, the Zimmerwald Commission arranged another conference in Kienthal, Switzerland, from the 24th to 29th of April, 1916. Kienthal attracted 44 delegates, but many of them came in a "personal" capacity. The conference denounced the "majority" socialists as "Social Patriots" and "Social Chauvinists," roundly condemned the International Socialist Bureau, declared a durable peace to be impossible without the complete triumph of the proletariat, and urged the socialists of all countries to make a concerted move for an immediate armistice.

III. "ON TO STOCKHOLM"

All through the latter part of 1916 and the early months of 1917, a feeling against the continuation of the war spread in the warring countries as a result of war-weariness, of the deadlock on the western and eastern fronts, of discontent with the failure of the governments to carry out reforms, and of the economic privations which fell heavily on the industrial and urban masses while certain sections of the population were said to be "profiteering." Under these conditions, the anti-war elements in the socialist and

labor movements made headway. In October, 1916, Friedrich Adler, a peaceful and scholarly young socialist of Vienna, shot the Austrian Premier, Count Stuergh, in a desperate attempt to protest against the "unequaled absolutism" which had fallen upon his country with the progress of the war. His act hastened the restoration of some of the constitutional liberties of the country and new moves for peace. In Germany, the "minority" socialists joined hands with the "International" group to form the Independent Socialist Party; while the extremist "left" group organized itself under the name of the Spartacus Bund. In France, "minority" socialists and anti-war syndicalists attacked the "Union Sacrée," promoted strikes in the war industries and discontent in the army, and urged the French Socialist Party to join hands with the Independent Socialists of Germany to bring about peace. In England, though "left wing" agitation was less vigorous than in France or Germany, the discontent of the workers broke out in strikes of munition workers, shipbuilders, and miners.

Then, in the early spring of 1917, came two events which precipitated these various trends into a general movement. On March 8, 1917, the war-starved population of Petrograd started a bread-riot which quickly became a revolution. Within a few weeks, the Czar had abdicated, a Russian Republic had been declared, and a new government formed which included socialists, some of whom had been delegates

at Zimmerwald. On April 7, 1917, President Wilson brought the United States into the war on the side of the Allies, expressly to "make the world safe for democracy" and to rebuild international life on the basis of his "fourteen points." Both the First Russian Revolution and America's entry into the war gave a tremendous impetus to the hope for an early and democratic peace which developed into a wide "peace-offensive" on both sides of the trenches.

It was under these conditions that the idea of a general international socialist conference loomed up with new force. Several conflicting proposals were made by the International Socialist Bureau; by a Dutch-Scandinavian Committee which had been organized in Stockholm early in 1917 by Branting, the leader of the Swedish Socialist Party; by the American Socialist Party, and by the Petrograd Council of Workers' and Soldiers' Deputies. But after some negotiations, an invitation for a general international socialist conference to be held in Stockholm on August 15, 1917, was issued by the International Socialist Bureau, the Dutch-Scandinavian Committee, and the Petrograd Soviet, acting together.

Thus, during the summer of 1917, while the war was in a critical stage from a military point of view and a general "peace drive" was in progress, the capital of Sweden became the center of socialist hopes and fears. In fact, whether the proposed conference

would take place or not, became a big issue of world politics. The state of mind of those days is vividly portrayed by an English writer as follows: "Peace seemed to come very near, and there was a stampede. . . . Distinguished socialists were sent to Petrograd¹⁴ to explain to their Russian comrades the necessity of going on with the war and returned dazed. . . . And they were able to communicate their feelings to their parties. The German (Socialist) Party, as a whole, suddenly refused to vote the war credits and the Kaiser was faced with such ferment that his Government decided it was the lesser of two evils to let the socialists, both majority and minority, go to Stockholm. . . .

"The French Socialist Party was turned upside down. . . . Cachin and Frossard, two Majority Socialists, on their return from a delegation to Petrograd, advised a special National Convention in Paris to go to Stockholm. The Convention, after a most violent and noisy sitting, unanimously decided to do so.¹⁵ More significant, perhaps, was the great excitement in the Paris Press, and the huge crowd waiting outside. It grew impatient, and cried out 'Go to Stockholm,' 'Down with the war. . . .'

"The Italian adhesion was a foregone conclusion,¹⁶ but a change in the British Labor Party was hardly

¹⁴ American socialists were on the Root Commission which went to Russia. All the Allied countries sent similar commissions.

¹⁵ That was on May 28, 1917.

¹⁶ The Italian Socialist Party decided in favor of Stockholm on June 6, 1917.

to be expected. Therefore, the collapse of the pro-war party was the more astonishing. Here the agent was a Cabinet Minister, Arthur Henderson. . . . He returned from a delegation to Petrograd in the late summer of 1917. He returned convinced of the necessity for the Stockholm Conference. Nobody treated him as yet very seriously, but on August 10, 1917, the Special Conference of the Labour Party approved his policy by 1,840,000 votes to 550,000. The effect on political life was shattering. The prospects of Stockholm and of the end of the war seemed 'set fair.' " ¹⁷

In addition to the German, French, Italian, Russian, and British socialists, the American socialists accepted the invitation to Stockholm.¹⁸ Also most of the groups affiliated with the Zimmerwald Commission decided to participate in the Stockholm conference. Lenin urged the "Zimmerwaldians" to "boycott Stockholm," on the ground that it was called by the "social patriots" as a "cover for negotiations between the belligerent governments," but he was overruled by the others.

¹⁷ Postgate, *The Workers' International*, pp. 100-2.

¹⁸ The American delegates were Morris Hillquit, Victor Berger and Algernon Lee. The American Socialist Party remained steadily anti-war. As a result, a number of socialists, including Charles Edward Russell, Chester M. Wright, and William E. Walling, deserted the party and in co-operation with the American Federation of Labor formed the American Alliance for Labor and Democracy for the support of "war morale." The Alliance denounced "Stockholm," which, in the words of Gompers, was merely a product of "insidious pro-Kaiser propaganda."

The conference, however, never assembled. The refusal of the American government to grant passports to the American socialist delegates encouraged the governments of Great Britain, France, and Italy to do the same. The hands of the governments were strengthened by the energetic action of the "anti-Stockholm men" in all the Allied countries. In England, the government was also upheld by the Seamen's Union whose president, Havelock Wilson, declared that no delegates to Stockholm would be allowed to travel on any ship manned by members of his union. Thus, when the time of the conference came, only delegates from the socialists of the Central Powers, Russia, and the neutral countries arrived, and the purpose of the conference was defeated.

IV. ENTER THE BOLSHEVIKI

With the fiasco of "Stockholm," the hope of a negotiated peace faded away. On both sides of the trenches, governments reorganized for the suppression of the "defeatist" movement and for decisive action on the fields of battle. It was now the "fight to the finish" which was to continue for another year, and which ended in the triumph of the Allies on November 11, 1918.

But while the war was being fought to its end, the factors ushered in by the Russian Revolution were rapidly assuming unexpected forms and meanings. On November 7, 1917, the Bolsheviks, under the

leadership of Lenin, Trotsky,¹⁰ Zinoviev, Kamenev, and others, staged the Second Russian Revolution and, after a few days of street fighting in the principal cities of Russia, captured the government and established themselves in power. Immediately, the Bolsheviks issued decrees giving land to the peasants, establishing workers' control in the factories, and nationalizing many industries and the State Bank. In January, 1918, they dissolved the Constituent Assembly as obsolete in view of the organization of the Soviets. Early in March, they signed a separate peace with Germany at Brest-Litovsk. A constitution was promulgated which declared Russia a Socialist Soviet Republic, based on the principle of the "dictatorship of the proletariat." On the last day of June, 1918, a sweeping decree was issued for the nationalization of the economic life of Russia. Finding themselves menaced, as a result of their activities, by foreign invasion and civil war, the Bolsheviks created a Red Army and instituted a system of government terror which was to be enforced by a special commission known as the Cheka. In less than a year, the Bolsheviks had thus carried out the program advocated by Lenin at Zimmerwald; they had withdrawn Russia from the war, and had started her on the path towards "proletarian dictatorship" and "social revolution," in accordance with what they regarded as true Marxian principles.

¹⁰ Trotsky joined the Bolshevik faction in the summer of 1917, after his return to Russia from the United States.

The repercussions of the first year of Bolshevism in the socialist and labor movement were twofold. On the one hand, there was a renewed agitation for peace, and a rising demand for political and social reforms. In the countries of the Central Powers, this new spirit began to become manifest early in 1918. In January of that year, there were large strikes in Germany and Austria. In May, there were demonstrations for universal suffrage in Budapest. In June, the workers of Vienna, under the leadership of the Austrian Social-Democracy, were demanding peace and bread. Early in July, a general strike broke out in Hungary. In August, the miners of Westphalia went on a general strike. Even the "Majority-Socialists" of Germany were becoming less tractable.²⁰ The Independent Socialists and the Spartacus Bund were active in the factories, in the army, and in the navy, building up "closely knit organizations of revolutionary delegates" modeled on Russian lines. In October, 1918, this rising tide swelled up in the revolutions which swept through Bulgaria, Hungary, Austria, culminating in the revolution in Germany, on November 9, 1918.

In the Allied countries, there was also a marked shift towards the left. Though held in bounds by the expectations of victory, the "new temper" in these countries manifested itself in the further suc-

²⁰ In the Reichstag, demands for peace and for political and social reforms were made with recurring frequency. See Laidler, *op. cit.*, p. 366.

cesses of the "minority" socialists, in the spread of socialistic ideas, and in a growing demand for "workers' control." In France, the "minority," led by Longuet, defeated the "majority" on July 28, 1918, and assumed the leadership of the French Socialist Party. In England, the British Labor Party adopted a program of a "New Social Order" definitely socialistic in character. In Italy, the socialist party expressed its sympathy for the Bolshevik experiment in Russia.

On the other hand, Bolshevism caused a wide rift in the labor and socialist movement of the world. The pre-war lines of division were redrawn in new and sharper forms and combinations around the new issue of "democracy versus dictatorship." "Majority" socialists of the "Right," and "Minority" socialists of the "Center," and even some of the "Left" repudiated the Bolshevik procedure in Russia—its forced nationalization of industry and its system of political dictatorship supported by terrorism—and proclaimed political democracy to be an inseparable part of socialism. Kautsky, from whose pre-war writings the Bolsheviks had drawn some of their inspiration, now took the lead in a ruthless campaign against Bolshevik ideas and methods which called forth violent and abusive retorts from Lenin and his followers. A scorn and hatred, unparalleled in the history of the socialist movement, filled the hearts of the members of the various factions for one another.

V. THE BERN CONFERENCE

Already in September, 1918, anticipating the end of the war, the socialists and labor leaders of the Allied countries held an Inter-Allied Socialist Conference in London to consider their rôle in the making of the future peace. It was decided to call a world labor and socialist conference to meet at the same time and place as the Peace Conference. A committee consisting of A. Henderson, A. Thomas, Vandervelde, and Gompers, was appointed to carry out the decision, in co-operation with Camille Huysmans, secretary of the International Socialist Bureau.

Accordingly, Arthur Henderson, shortly after the Armistice, issued a call to the trade unions and socialists of all countries inviting them to a general conference. As Clemenceau refused to allow delegates from enemy countries to come to Paris, the place of the conference was changed to Bern, Switzerland, and the time was fixed for February 3, 1919.

Henderson's call met with opposition from several sides. The Belgian Labor Party refused to meet the Germans, and Vandervelde resigned from the committee. Gompers would have nothing to do with it because it was a "socialist" gathering. On the other hand, the socialist parties of Italy, Switzerland, Serbia, and Rumania refused to be represented because it was called by socialists who had played a "reactionary" part during the war.

Nevertheless, owing to the efforts of the British Labor Party and of the French Socialist Party, a combined socialist and labor conference met at Bern from February 2 to February 9, 1919, separate sessions of socialists and of trade unionists running at the same time. The socialist sessions which began on February 3, were attended by 97 delegates from 26 countries, and were presided over by Branting, the socialist leader of Sweden.²¹ It was a tense assembly surcharged with the hatreds and bitter memories of four years of war.

Much wrangling was caused by the reluctance of the German "Majority" socialists to commit themselves to a direct admission of Germany's war guilt, which was demanded by the socialists of the Allied countries. At last a compromise formula was produced which declared that the immediate responsibility of the war "had been made clear through the discussion and through the declaration of the German 'Majority' socialists" that the new Germany signified a complete "separation from the old system which was responsible for the war." A compromise was also reached on Bolshevism. The majority were in favor of a resolution prepared by Branting and endorsed by Ramsay MacDonald which "firmly adhered to the principles of democracy" and which warned against the danger of class dictatorship. But as a strong minority led by Jean Longuet of France and by Friedrich Adler of Austria refused to con-

²¹ For the trade union sessions, see Chapter VIII, pp. 188-191.

demn the Soviet regime on the grounds that the information at hand was inadequate, the vote on the subject was postponed until a commission could visit Russia and report on conditions there.

In dealing with the Peace Treaty, the Bern Conference, without much disagreement, endorsed President Wilson's "fourteen points" and demanded the creation of a League of Nations including all nations and composed of delegates not of governments, but of parliaments. The conference also voted in favor of the reannexation of Alsace-Lorraine to France without a plebiscite, and laid down the general principle that all nationalities and fractions of nationalities should be given "full rights."

The Bern Conference wound up by appointing three special committees. A Committee of Action was sent to Paris to exercise pressure on the peace makers at Versailles. A Commission of Inquiry was appointed to report on Russia. And a Commission for the Reconstruction of the International was elected to continue the work of reconciliation among the socialists and trade unionists of all countries in order to re-establish a permanent international organization.

VI. THE "INTERNATIONAL OF ACTION"

To the Bolsheviks, the possible revival of the Second International, begun at Bern, presaged no good. It meant, in their opinion, that the masses would fall

again under the influence of the "social patriots" who, in 1914, had "betrayed socialism" and who, in 1919, were opposed to revolution. The Bolsheviks were now certain that a new International had to be formed. The course of events in Europe during the three months after the Armistice—the formation of republican and socialist governments in Austria, Hungary, and Germany, and the struggle of the more radical workers' groups for the establishment of Soviets and for the socialization of industry, as exemplified by the Spartacists' uprising in Berlin on January 6, 1919,—seemed to them to bear out their prediction that the World War would be followed by World Revolution.

This belief could not but be of tremendous importance to the Bolsheviks. They were surrounded at the time by the "sanitary cordon" which the Allies were trying to draw more tightly. British and Japanese troops were at Vladivostok; British and American troops were at Archangel; Ukraine was in the hands of Skoropadski and overrun by bandits; the provinces on the Baltic were not only seceding from Russia, but creating much disorder in the process; on the East was the self-proclaimed "Dictator of Russia," Kolchak, who had entrenched himself at Omsk; while in the districts under Bolshevik rule there was discontent in the villages and great privation and suffering in the cities. Under these conditions, the idea of a revolution spreading through Central Europe and then involving the Al-

lied countries carried with it the potency of an almost mystic faith in a great and sudden deliverance.²²

Anxious to counteract the work of the Bern Conference, the Bolsheviks had hurriedly wirelessly from Moscow on January 24, 1919, a call for a meeting to form a new communist International.²³ In accordance with this invitation, there was held in Moscow, from March 2 to March 6, 1919, the first international communist conference. The invitation sent out in January, had enumerated a long list of groups and organizations which the Bolsheviks hoped to attract into their camp. The conference, however, was incompletely attended because the invitation reached some groups too late, because of passport difficulties, blockades, and other obstacles to entrance into Russia. The Moscow conference claimed that the delegates represented "left wing" and "revolutionary" organizations of 34 countries. But most of the delegates present had no definite credentials and no authority, while others repre-

²² When the news of the revolutions in Austria and Germany reached Moscow, there was a tremendous outburst of jubilation, not only among the Bolsheviks, but among the general half-starved population. Mensheviks, Left Social Revolutionists, and the Bund, who had opposed Bolshevism until then, rallied to the support of the Soviet government. At their annual meeting in December, 1918, the Russian Bolshevik Party felt justified in declaring that the "socialist revolution in Germany showed that the proletarian world revolution was not a fantastic dream, but an inevitable fact."

²³ In March, 1918, the Russian Bolsheviks had adopted the name of Russian Communist Party.

sented small and uncertain groups. Delegates with full voting rights came from 19 groups, chiefly from countries of Eastern and Central Europe. Individuals not officially accredited, represented the Swiss Social Democratic Party and the Socialist Labor Party of the United States. "Advisory" delegates attended from France, Great Britain, Czechoslovakia, and some countries of Asia. The sessions were held in a small room in the Kremlin, draped with banners bearing in many languages, the motto: "Long Live the Third International!"

Formally, the Moscow Conference regarded itself as the outgrowth of the "Zimmerwald movement." It, therefore, dissolved the Zimmerwald Commission and constituted the Third or Communist International. The ideas which were to guide the new organization were formulated in a "Manifesto to the Proletariat of all Countries." According to this Manifesto, the "Imperialist War" which had pitted nation against nation was passing in all countries into a civil war which was lining up class against class. The "bourgeoisie" which had brought on the war was paying the price for the devastation it had wrought. It was everywhere bankrupt, unable to organize production, and making vain efforts to re-establish international life by means of a League of Nations. It was helpless before the very forces which it had itself called into being—a socialized war economy, a revolutionary working class, rebellious colonies, and militant small nationalities—which

were breaking the framework of capitalistic imperialism.

A return to the past was declared impossible. The only way out of the "harrowing reality of impoverishment" and out of the political and social chaos which the war had brought, was for the proletariat in all countries to assume the direction of affairs and to establish socialism. The workers were called upon to socialize at once natural resources, large scale industry, commerce, and credit. To achieve this, the workers were to rise as an organized mass, disarm the bourgeoisie, form councils of workers and peasants, create a government of Soviets, organize Red Armies in self-defense, and establish in every country a "Dictatorship of the Proletariat," on the model of the Russian Soviet system.

Surveying the role of the socialists during the war, the "Manifesto" arraigned in scathing terms not only the "Social Patriots" of "the Right," but also the "hazy, fickle, and irresolute Center" represented by the Independent Socialists of Germany, the British Independent Labor Party, and the French followers of Longuet. The latter were declared to be an even greater danger to the "Proletarian Revolution," because their mild radicalism and their appeals for compromise and unity tended to prolong the agony of the struggle. The "Manifesto" called upon the workers to fight both the "Right" and the "Center" and to follow only those "Left" groups which were ready to join hands in the new Communist

International for the immediate overthrow of capitalism.

In view of its incomplete character, the Moscow conference adopted only provisional statutes and appointed a temporary executive committee. Zinoviev was made chairman of the executive committee, and Angelica Balabanoff its secretary, and they were entrusted with the job of putting life into the hastily and somewhat artificially produced new organization.

Looking at it historically, the founders of the new International declared that they were "the followers and fulfillers of the program" which had been announced 72 years before by Marx in his "Communist Manifesto." In their perspective, the First International had been "the prophet of the future," and the Second International—the "organizer of millions." The task of the Third International was to become the "International of Action."

CHAPTER VIII

THE INTERNATIONAL FEDERATION OF TRADE UNIONS, 1914-1919

In the international political labor movement, the transformation wrought by the World War and by the Russian Revolution was first evidenced in the origin of the Third International. In the trade union movement, it was seen in the re-establishment of the International Federation of Trade Unions on a new basis and with a new program. The story of this re-establishment is the second link in the chain of pre-war and post-war developments.

In accordance with its pre-war character,¹ the International Federation of Trade Unions² was unprepared for an active part in the tangle of events which led up to the declarations of war in August, 1914. On July 30, 1914, Legien cabled Gompers for an expression of opinion on the "war troubles." Gompers replied that all wars were deplorable, but suggested no course of action. On July 31, Leon Jouhaux, secretary of the French Confederation of Labor, wrote Legien that the French and German

¹ See Chapter IV.

² This International is usually designated by its initials as the I. F. T. U.

workers could play "a great rôle" in the emergency and proposed a special meeting of the trade union delegates who were coming to the International Socialist Congress of Paris on August 9.³ His letter fell into the hands of the German censor and was not released until the end of September.

I. FRIENDLY ENEMIES

With the declaration of war, the trade unions in the warring countries aligned themselves with their respective governments. The German trade union leaders, "after receiving assurances of the government on August 1, 1914, that they would remain unmolested and that trade union offices would rank as essential war undertakings, accorded the most loyal support to the civil and military authorities."⁴ In England, the British Trade Union Congress and the Federation of British Trade Unions, placed the responsibility for the war on Germany and pledged their full support to the British government. In France, the syndicalists, especially Jouhaux, threw their energies into the service of the government. Industrial truces were concluded, trade union rules were suspended, and labor leaders sat on joint councils with employers and government officials.

During the first war months, letters continued to be exchanged between the trade union leaders of Germany, England, France, the United States, and

³ See Chapter VI, p. 136.

⁴ Ströbel, H., *The German Revolution and After*, p. 46.

other countries. Legien took the attitude that as the workers were not responsible for the war, and as the war would not last long, it was necessary to maintain international labor contacts as much as possible during the war. On August 25, 1914, he requested the trade union centers of the neutral countries to send him reports on the Entente countries, promising to supply similar news on Germany. On September 10, a Swiss who had been employed in the office of the I. F. T. U., and who had returned to Switzerland, wrote, by agreement with Legien, to the French Confederation of Labor. On September 23, A. Baumeister, Legien's first assistant, wrote again to Jouhaux from Copenhagen. On September 25, Legien wrote to Mertens, secretary of the Belgian trade unions, deploring the "wretched war," claiming that "the International Bureau continued to function," and asking for "information, newspapers, cuttings" to help "offset the lies" that were being circulated about labor and socialist activities.

Legien's efforts called forth a varied response. Appleton, of the British Federation of Trade Unions, and Gompers were friendly. On August 25, 1914, Appleton sent his "cordial greetings" to Legien via the Danish trade unions. On November 11, 1914, he wrote to Gompers that he had not heard from Legien recently but "can imagine how heart-brokenly he (Legien) surveys the wreckage. . . . For the moment we can do little to help or comfort him, but whenever the opportunity

occurs we must assure and reassure him of our continued trust and regard."

Gompers wrote Legien much in the same spirit. In a letter dated September 30, 1914, Gompers expressed the wish that after the war an international trade union congress might be held in the United States, and concluded with the following words: "In sadness, and yet in hope for the best, I send fraternal greetings to you and your fellow trade unionists of Germany." There seems little doubt that Gompers had his sympathies, but he was holding himself in leash partly because of his desire to maintain the policy of neutrality which the American government was sponsoring, partly because he hoped the war would give the American Federation of Labor an opportunity to act as mediator in renewing international labor relations and in influencing the terms of peace.⁵

The French and Belgian trade unionists were cool to Legien's advances. Jouhaux and Merrheim, in a letter to Legien, in October, 1914, referred bitterly to the "brutal fact" that "every day thousands of Belgian, German, British, Austrian and French

⁵ The Philadelphia convention of the American Federation of Labor held in November, 1914, rejected a resolution by Furuseth "holding the present awful struggle to be too fundamental to be blamed on any particular government or people." It endorsed Gompers' idea "to call a meeting of representatives of organized labor of different nations to meet the same time and place (as the General Peace Congress), in order to restore fraternal relations, protect the interests of the toilers, and assist in laying the foundations for a more lasting peace."

workers were mown down by bullets, wounded or killed, on the European battlefield" and arraigned vehemently "German militarism" and "Prussian Imperialism." At the same time, however, they assured Legien that the French Confederation of Labor was still, as in the past, "firmly attached to the cause of internationalism." Mertens curtly informed Legien on November 7, in a formal note, that the present moment was not "opportune" for carrying out his request.

II. DRIFTING APART

As the military conflict became more intense, this friendly or near-friendly correspondence ceased. Legien's activities became suspect to the trade union leaders of the Allied countries. In order to meet the difficulties created by the war, Legien on November 23, 1914, designated the Dutch trade union center as a branch office of the I. F. T. U. in charge of Jan Oudegeest, and urged the trade union centers of the Entente countries to keep in communication with it.^o The neutral countries were to continue to deal directly with Legien in Berlin. But neither Appleton nor Jouhaux would accept this arrangement, and proposed that the Bureau of the I. F. T. U. be transferred to Bern, Switzerland, and that a "more neutral" executive committee be appointed. They sent

^o Oudegeest had suggested to Legien on September 30, 1914, that he remove the International Secretariat to a neutral country. Legien replied, on October 7, that it was possible to keep the "International fully in being" from Berlin.

this proposal to Gompers who forwarded it to Legien on March 4, 1915.

Legien was hurt by this request. He claimed that he was maintaining "old relations, as far as possible, with all nationalities, ably assisted in this direction by Brother Oudegeest" and that Sweden, Holland, and Germany had paid their usual dues. But, as the question had been raised, he instructed Oudegeest to issue a call for an international conference of trade union representatives to consider the proposal.

Oudegeest acted on Legien's instructions, but the majority of the trade union centers declared that a conference was unnecessary and that no changes should be made in the I. F. T. U. during the war.⁷ Displeased with this result, Jouhaux set up an International Correspondence Bureau in Paris for communications between the trade unions of the Allied and neutral countries.⁸ By May, 1915, there were thus three different centers for maintaining international trade union contacts—Berlin, Amsterdam, and Paris.

While the trade union centers of the warring countries were drifting apart, there appeared the first

⁷ Appleton wrote Oudegeest on May 10, 1915, a few days after the sinking of the *Lusitania*, that an international conference would be impossible, not only on account of the difficulties of travel, but because of the new temper in England aroused by "German atrocities."

⁸ Mertens, Corneille, *Le Mouvement Syndical International*, 1923, p. 12.

harbingers of trade union anti-war groups in Germany, England, and France. In the first two countries, these trade unionists followed the lead of the anti-war socialists.⁹ But in France, they took an active part in starting the anti-war movement. Already, in December, 1914, when the French Confederation of Labor refused to attend the conference called by the Scandinavian socialists,⁹ a minority of 26 votes (against 78) protested against this decision, and Pierre Monatte, an influential syndicalist, resigned from the executive committee of the Confederation. In the spring of 1915, A. Merrheim, secretary of the Metal Workers' Federation, and Bourderon, a member of the executive committee of the Confederation of Labor, took the lead in the anti-war movement. In the summer of 1915, they were joined by Louise Saumonneau, and others of the Teachers' Federation whose rallying cry was "no more shedding of blood!" As described in the preceding chapter, Merrheim and Bourderon attended Zimmerwald, and upon their return to France ¹⁰ formed the "committee for the renewal of international relations."

In the course of 1916, the anti-war minority in the French Confederation of Labor, under the leadership of Monatte, Merrheim, Saumonneau, Bourderon, and Loriot, grew in numbers and influence. They

⁹ See Chapter VII, pp. 153-154.

⁹ See Chapter VII, p. 151.

¹⁰ See Chapter VII, p. 156.

worked hand in hand with the anti-war socialists, throwing their influence in favor of a general international labor and socialist conference in 1916 and for the slogan "On to Stockholm!" in 1917. On the other hand, the officials and leaders of the trade union centers worked in close co-operation with the pro-war "Majority" socialists.

III. LEEDS AND BERN

While bending their efforts to win the war for their respective countries, the trade union leaders, from 1916 on, became concerned about the possible results of the war for the workers and about the specific demands of labor in the coming treaty of peace. This mentality was first manifested at the Inter-Allied Trade Union Conference held at Leeds on July 5, 1916, which was attended by trade union delegates from England, France, Belgium, and Italy.¹¹ The Leeds conference approved the proposal of Jouhaux in favor of demanding the incorporation into the Peace Treaty of special labor clauses. The resolution passed by the conference asked that the Peace Treaty should "insure to the working class of all countries a minimum of guarantees of a moral, as well as of a material kind, concerning the right of coalition, emigration, social insurance, hours of

¹¹ The Leeds conference showed its war temper by rejecting the proposal of the American Federation of Labor that a general international labor conference be held at the same time and place as the Peace Conference. The Allied workers, it was declared, were not yet, and would not so soon be, ready to meet the Germans.

labor, hygiene, and protection of labor, in order to secure them against the attacks of international capitalist competition," and demanded the establishment of an international commission of inspection and of an international office to collect statistics. Shortly after the Leeds conference, Jouhaux sent this resolution to the trade unions affiliated with the I. F. T. U. for their examination.

Aroused by the proceedings at Leeds and by Jouhaux's activities, Legien, on October 4, 1916, issued a call for an international trade union conference to be held in Bern on December 11, 1916. However, at the suggestion of the Scandinavian trade unions that the time was not ripe for a representative conference, he canceled the call. With Legien's approval, the Swiss Trade Union Federation then offered to arrange an international labor conference in Bern in 1917. On March 28, 1917, the Swiss, having secured the approval of the trade unions of the neutral countries, addressed the trade union centers of the United States, Belgium, France, England, Italy, and Spain, asking them to decide in favor of an international conference.

While these efforts were being made, the call for the socialist conference at Stockholm was issued.¹² It was at once suggested that the planned trade union conference also be held in Stockholm. As the Swiss Federation of Trade Unions refused to arrange such a conference, Oudegeest issued a call

¹² See Chapter VII, p. 159.

from the Amsterdam branch of the I. F. T. U. for an international conference to be held in Stockholm on June 8, 1917.

In reply to this invitation, there gathered in Stockholm, on the date fixed, trade union officials from Germany, Austria, Hungary, Bulgaria, Holland, Denmark, Norway, Sweden, and Finland. The trade unions of Switzerland and Belgium refused to be present; those of France and England took no notice; while Gompers, who was denouncing the "socialist Stockholm" as "insidious Pro-Kaiser propaganda," rejected also the idea of a "trade unionist Stockholm" as "premature."

In view of its unrepresentative character, the Stockholm conference decided not to deal with economic and social peace programs. It authorized the Swiss Federation of Trade Unions to try again to convene an international labor conference in Bern in September, 1917. It also sent a telegram to Jouhaux "welcoming" the resolutions of the Leeds Conference.

On June 30, 1917, the Swiss Federation of Trade Unions issued a call for an international labor conference to meet at Bern on October 1, 1917.¹³ The conference was to consider two problems: the constitution and place of headquarters of the I. F. T. U., and secondly, the trade union peace program.

When the conference met on October 1, only trade

¹³ The date was changed from September 17 to October 1, by agreement with Legien.

union delegates from the Central Powers and from a few neutral countries were present. The countries represented were Germany, Austria, Hungary, Czechoslovakia, Bulgaria, Switzerland, Holland, Denmark, Norway, Sweden. Trade union delegates from France could not attend because the French government would not issue passports. The Belgian, British, and American trade unions refused to take part in the conference.

The Bern conference had some difficulty with the first item on its agenda. It received a telegram from Jouhaux urging the removal of the headquarters of the I. F. T. U. to a neutral country. Many of the delegates were in favor of the idea as likely to ease international contacts. But Legien opposed it on the ground that under the circumstances it would mean a "vote of censure on Germany." As a compromise, the conference tabled the proposal for the time being and authorized the branch office at Amsterdam to act as the intermediary in international relations.

In relation to the second item on the agenda, the Bern conference adopted a program which incorporated most of the demands of the Leeds conference and a few more in addition. The most significant additions were the demands that the governments at war should allow trade union representatives to take part in formulating the economic and social sections of the Peace Treaty and that the I. F. T. U. should be recognized as the spokesman of labor in

official proceedings dealing with international labor legislation.

IV. GOMPERS VERSUS EUROPE

During the last year of the war, as described elsewhere, the leadership in the movement for the re-establishment of international labor relations was taken by British and French labor. The French Socialist Party co-operated with the French Confederation of Labor, the Federation of British Trade Unions, and the British Trade Union Congress, to arrange the Bern Conference of 1919. British and French labor leaders, however, had to reckon now with American labor, as represented by Samuel Gompers. In the course of 1917-18, the idea, conceived at the very outset of the war, of playing a leading part in renewing international labor relations and in making peace, became complicated in Gompers' mind by war emotions. As a member of the National Defense Council, he played an important part in promoting war activities, and it augmented his belief that he was to play a vital part in the international drama.¹⁴ The many invitations that came to him, during 1917-18, to visit the Allied countries strengthened this feeling. At the same time in his struggle against "German espionage" and "pro-Germans," he came to suspect all international efforts made by socialists or by labor people, and committed the A. F. of L. to a refusal to meet labor

¹⁴ See Gompers, *op. cit.*, vol. II, pp. 350-376.

representatives of enemy countries. His pre-war hate of socialism and of socialists became more intense as a result of the anti-war position of the American Socialist Party.

Gompers' attitude brought him into conflict with the labor leaders of the Allied countries, and with Oudegeest, the acting chairman of the I. F. T. U. Foreseeing the end of the war, Oudegeest, on October 25, 1918, wired a request to the national trade union centers to appoint delegates to an international trade union conference to be held at the time and place of the official peace negotiations, to consider the reorganization of the I. F. T. U. and the Leeds and Bern peace programs. A day later, Oudegeest sent out a letter in which he explained that his invitation was merely an application of the ideas expressed at Leeds in 1916, at Bern in 1917, and by Gompers on various occasions. After consultation with labor leaders of the Allied countries, Oudegeest shortly afterward decided that it would be impossible to hold an international conference in Paris and changed the place of meeting to Amsterdam.

Gompers was unpleasantly aroused by Oudegeest's initiative. He felt that Oudegeest, though claiming to be carrying out Gompers' own plan, was usurping the leadership.¹⁵ On November 20, 1918, the Executive Committee of the American Federation of Labor replied to Oudegeest that "in compliance with in-

¹⁵ Besides, Gompers regarded Oudegeest as a "pro-German."

structions of several conventions of the American Federation of Labor, Executive Council will issue invitations for international labor conference to consider and help in peace discussions and to establish new international trade union federation." Gompers refused to accept either the Leeds or the Bern peace programs, and insisted on a statement of peace terms which "offered no leniency to the foes of democracy."

At the same time Gompers was resentful of the summons which A. Henderson had sent out for the international conference in Bern.¹⁶ Gompers made it clear that "the American delegates were ready and willing to meet the representatives of labor of the Allied countries in a purely trade union conference," but that they were "disinclined to sit in conference with representatives of enemy countries for the present at least, or in a conference in which the aims and purposes of organized labor would be subordinated to those of any partisan political movement." Gompers objected to holding a conference in a neutral country.¹⁷ Instead Gompers suggested an Inter-Allied conference in Paris for the purpose of presenting the demands of Allied labor to the Peace Conference and of removing the I. F. T. U. from Berlin.

In this plan Gompers had the support of some

¹⁶ See Chapter VII, p. 166.

¹⁷ The purpose, as Gompers explains in his *Autobiography*, was to guard against a "Bolshevik stampede" and to prevent the Germans from occupying a position of equality.

trade union leaders of Belgium and France. Jouhaux, in the name of the International Correspondence Bureau, issued a call for a preliminary Inter-Allied labor conference to be held in Paris on January 30, 1919. On the other hand, Oudegeest called a general international labor conference for March 8, 1919, at Amsterdam. Besides these two invitations there had been also issued, as related above, Henderson's invitation to the Bern conference for February 2, 1919.

V. BERN AND VERSAILLES

Of the three conferences planned, that which convened at Bern on February 2, 1919,¹⁸ was the first gathering after 1914 at which delegates from Allied, Central, and neutral countries were present. The trade union sessions were held on February 5 and 6, 1919, and were attended by 53 trade union delegates from 16 countries. British labor was represented by the British Trade Union Congress. Jouhaux attended as representative of the French Confederation of Labor, but Mertens and Gompers stayed away.

After some friction, the Bern conference drew up an International Labor Charter which combined the program of the Leeds conference of 1916 with that of the Bern conference of October, 1917. The Charter demanded compulsory primary education

¹⁸ The conference called by Jouhaux was not held as only French and American delegates turned up on the appointed day.

and higher education free to all, an eight-hour day, a weekly rest period of 36 hours, a six-hour day for young workers under 18 years of age, the abolition of night work for women, a comprehensive system of social insurance, labor exchanges, and an international code for seamen. A permanent international commission composed of representatives of the League of Nations was to supervise the execution of this program, while an International Labor Parliament consisting of an equal number of trade union delegates and of delegates appointed by governments was to meet regularly and to make laws affecting labor and having the same validity as national laws. A committee was appointed to present this Charter to the Peace Conference at Versailles.

The Bern conference also took steps to reconstitute the I. F. T. U. Oudegeest was wired for, and was commissioned to convene a conference for the purpose, in May, 1919, in co-operation with the International Correspondence Bureau of Paris and with the national trade union centers.

While the Bern conference was assembling, the first effects of the post-war upheaval¹⁰ were beginning to make themselves felt at Versailles. Aroused by the threat of revolutionary movements, the Peace Conference on January 25, 1919, appointed a Commission on International Labor Legislation to formulate special labor clauses for the Treaty of Peace.

¹⁰ See Chapter IX, pp. 197-200.

Gompers had a large part in the making of this Commission. He kept in close touch with the Peace Commissioners, and had conferences with President Wilson in order to present to him "the just hopes and aspirations of the working people." When the Commission on International Labor Legislation was created, Gompers was appointed the American member of it,²⁰ and at the first session was elected chairman. In this capacity, Gompers did his utmost to model the report of the Commission upon the principles which had been formulated at the 1917 convention of the A. F. of L. and which he regarded as a specific American contribution.

On May 11, 1919, the Commission submitted a final draft which was later adopted by the Peace Congress and which became Part XIII of the Treaty of Versailles, otherwise known as the Labor Convention.²¹ In more than one respect, this Convention fell short of the Bern Labor Charter and of the demands put forth by the American Federation of Labor. Its formulation of general principles was somewhat vague; it provided for a 24 hour rest period a week instead of 36 hours; it was not specific enough on the question of child labor, and said nothing about night work of women, or a seamen's code, or social insurance. It gave only limited powers to

²⁰ The other labor members of the Commission were L. Jouhaux for France, and G. N. Barnes for England.

²¹ It was incorporated later in the Treaties of Neuilly, Trianon, and St. Germain.

the International Labor Office and to the Annual International Conference, the two component parts of the International Labor Organization which it created.²²

VI. THE NEW I. F. T. U.

Within a month after the signing of the Peace Treaty incorporating the International Labor Convention,²³ the international congress which was to re-establish the I. F. T. U.—the first international trade union congress ever held—met at Amsterdam. This time Gompers, who had become vitally interested in the success of President Wilson's peace program in general and of Part XIII of the Peace Treaty in particular, accepted the invitation and headed a delegation of three to Amsterdam.²⁴

The general congress was preceded by a preliminary conference which was held on July 25 and 26, also at Amsterdam, for the purpose of allowing the Belgians to "square accounts" with the Germans and of winding up the affairs of the pre-war organization. The preliminary conference was attended by 22 trade union officials from the United States, Great Britain, France, Belgium, Spain, Germany, Austria, Holland, Switzerland, Sweden, and Norway, and was marked

²² See Chapter XIX.

²³ The Peace Treaty was signed at Versailles on June 28, 1919.

²⁴ The other members of the American delegation were Daniel J. Tobin, vice-president of the A. F. of L., and John J. Hynes, president of the Amalgamated Sheet Metal Workers.

by scenes in which the "war psychosis" took its toll in mutual recriminations and accusations. Mertens of Belgium attacked the leaders of the German trade unions for their conduct during the war in an "indictment burning in its intensity" and demanded an admission of guilt from the German delegation. He was supported by Gompers who, in a vigorous speech "minutely, and in detail, called attention to the negligence, failure and inefficiency of the officers of the international trade union movement in Germany and their refusal to take definite and effective action to prevent the United States from being dragged into the war."

In the sub-committees which dealt with this question, the wrangle was over the so-called Sassenbach resolution in which Germany was declared to have been the aggressor in the war and which expressed regret for the "wrong done to Belgium," offering as an excuse the deception practiced on the German workers by the Imperial German Government. The German delegates made, retracted, and then reaffirmed the above resolution. Even after the Germans accepted the Sassenbach resolution, Gompers accused them of being "not repentant," but "arrogant" and "domineering," despite the outcome of the war.

With the settling of the war guilt in this manner, the affairs of the pre-war international labor organization were quickly liquidated, and the first constituent congress of the new International Federation of

Trade Unions was called to order on July 28, 1919, in the Concertgebouw, in Amsterdam.

This Congress lasted till August 2, 1919, and was a new departure in the history of international trade unionism. It was attended by 91 delegates duly elected by national trade unions of 14 countries with a membership of 17,740,000 workers.²⁵ The voting was on a basis of proportional representation which gave the Allied countries 27 votes as against 15 for Germany and Austria, and 7 for the neutral countries. The discussion ranged over the whole field of international politics and economics.

Hardly a session passed without "stormy discussions" and "collisions." Especially acrimonious were the debates on the International Labor Convention, on the League of Nations, and on socialism. Gompers and the British delegates felt that the Labor Convention was an achievement of Allied labor and wanted to endorse it, stressing its virtues rather than its deficiencies. Gompers admitted that "the treaty was not perfect," but he claimed that "it was far in advance of any other of similar character," and that "for the first time in history, the rights, interests, and welfare of the workers received specific recognition in an international peace treaty."²⁶

²⁵ The countries represented were: The United States, Great Britain, France, Belgium, Germany, Austria, Czechoslovakia, Spain, Switzerland, Sweden, Norway, Denmark, Holland, and Luxemburg. The British Trade Union Congress and the General Federation of British Trade Unions agreed to represent British organized labor jointly.

²⁶ Gompers, *op. cit.*, Vol. II, p. 499.

Legien led the rest of the congress in opposition to the discrepancies between Part XIII of the Peace Treaty and the Bern Charter. Legien went so far as to insinuate that any man who could acquiesce in these deficiencies must be in the pay of the capitalist class, thus provoking a scene with Gompers. The congress, with only the British and Americans in the negative, voted that "it cannot accept as the full expression of the demand of the working classes of all countries the clauses of the Charter of Labor as contained in the Treaty of Versailles." The congress consented to participate in the first International Labor Conference under the League of Nations, scheduled to meet in Washington in October, 1919, only on condition that Germany and Austria be invited,²⁷ and that workers' representation be confined to members of trade union centers affiliated with the I. F. T. U.

On resolutions covering the League of Nations and the program of the International Federation of Trade Unions, the Continental point of view again clashed with the American. On the League of Nations, the resolution offered by Gompers was displaced by a more critical one in which the "firm conviction" was expressed that the League of Nations should be "elected by the nations themselves," and that the "labor classes" should prevent the League from becoming "the center of reaction and oppression" by establishing themselves as "an

²⁷ This was warmly supported by Jouhaux; Gompers and the British delegates voted against it.

effective controlling organ" of the League. The congress declared "capitalism" impotent to "reorganize" production in such a way as to insure the well-being of the masses of the people" and called for "complete trade union organization as the necessary basis for the realization of the socialization of the means of production."²⁸

There were also clashes on questions of organization and dues. The Americans and the British were at one in desiring a form of proportional representation which would favor the larger countries. After "lengthy and heated" debate, it was finally decided to allow one vote for 250,000 members or less; two votes for a membership of 250,000 to 500,000; three votes for a membership of 500,000 to 1,000,000; and one vote for every 500,000 members or fraction thereof above 1,000,000. The rules also provided that all decisions should be made binding by majority vote, and not by unanimity as had been the rule before the war. This rule was very obnoxious to the American delegation.

The per capita tax agreed on was one-half of one American cent per member per year. The majority of the congress were in favor of higher dues, but the British and American delegates claimed that their share of the cost was already too high.²⁹

²⁸ Gompers abstained from voting on the League of Nations resolution and voted against the second part of the resolution on socialization. See proceedings of convention of A. F. of L., 1920, p. 153.

²⁹ The annual dues of the A. F. of L., on the basis of the dues adopted, was \$20,000 for 1919.

Despite all these obstacles, a constitution and statutes were finally adopted which launched the International Federation of Trade Unions. Headquarters were established in Amsterdam; a bureau of five, consisting of a president, two vice-presidents, and two secretaries, was to direct the affairs of the new organization, subject to the semi-annual meetings of a Management Committee of Ten. W. A. Appleton, of the General Federation of British Trade Unions, was elected president of the new organization. The Germans wanted Legien to have the post of first vice-president; when he was not offered that, he refused the post of second vice-president. L. Jouhaux, of the French Confederation of Labor, and Corneille Mertens, of the Belgian trade unions, were then elected first and second vice-president respectively; Oudegeest and Fimmen, both of Holland, became the two secretaries. Gompers was not eligible to office since the American delegation did not commit itself, awaiting the decision of the A. F. of L. convention.

When the Amsterdam congress adjourned on August 2, 1919, its participants and principal actors believed that the first step towards a "new international unity" had been taken. What had been broken up by the war was not only being repaired, but improved. In place of the pre-war International Secretariat, with its limited program, there was now an International Federation of Trade Unions designed for concerted action on a large trade union and social scale.

CHAPTER IX

WORLD UPHEAVAL, 1919-1920

The "greatest war in human annals" was followed, during 1917-1920, by the greatest revolutionary upheaval of modern times. Not only the defeated countries, but the victorious and neutral as well, were swashed by a rising tide which, though varying in violence and sweep from country to country, was the same in character—a revolt against "the old order of things." The upheaval began with the Russian Revolution of 1917; it broadened out with the revolutions in Central Europe immediately after the Armistice; it reached its peak and assumed world-wide scope in 1919-20.

I. POST-WAR UNREST

There were many elements in this world upheaval which complicated its manifestations in different countries. There was war weariness in the countries which had gone through the four years of conflict. There was the unloosening of discipline due to demobilization. There was the bitterness of defeat in the countries of the Central Powers, and the high hopes of the people in the Allied countries. There was the widespread belief in the coming of a "new

world order'' aroused by President Wilson's winged phrases and by the Russian Revolution, and the consequent disappointment with the Versailles Treaty of Peace. There was the enthusiasm for the building of a new national life in the newly created countries ¹ and the outburst of intense nationalistic hatreds and conflicts which went with it. There were the devastation wrought by the war and the difficulties of physical reconstruction. There was the hovering fear of renewed war and of continued instability on account of reparations, of relations with Soviet Russia, of fixing boundaries in Central and Southeastern Europe, and of the rising nationalistic temper in Asia. And permeating all, was the industrial unrest everywhere brought on by the post-war economic boom, by the skyrocketing of prices, and by financial inflation.

1. Labor's Part

Labor's part in this upheaval took several forms. In practically all countries of the world, there was a great expansion of labor organization. The trade union membership of the world increased from some 15 million in 1913 to 45 million in 1920. This was due in part to the social prestige which trade unions had acquired during the war, when trade union leaders had become familiar figures on government commissions, in cabinets, and in tribunals of various

¹ Czechoslovakia, Poland, Yugoslavia, Rumania, Finland, Lithuania, etc.

kinds. But in the main, it was the result of the factors which became operative in the post-armistice days. Uncertain political and social conditions called forth a strong need in protective organization;² the industrial boom and the rise in prices made workers seek the aid of trade unions to maintain the war gains in earnings and in status; while the vision of a "new social order" aroused an interest in trade unionism on an unprecedented scale.

Backed by such support and temper, labor everywhere reached out for new rights, wider powers, and larger functions. Sweeping demands for the democratization of government and political life were made. New laws were put forth which promised to make the trade unions an integral part of the economic and legal system. Comprehensive plans of social insurance were formulated to take the place of the older laws. Collective bargaining was pushed on a scale unknown before the war, and government machinery for dealing with industrial problems, already built up during the war, was extended with a view of allowing labor organizations regulative and administrative functions in industry. New demands such as family wages and paid annual vacations were added to labor's list. Beyond the question of wages and hours of leisure, of new edu-

² In many countries there were created various government funds to assist workers in readjusting themselves to post-war conditions; the administration of some of these funds was entrusted to the trade unions which was an inducement to large numbers of workers to enter trade union organizations.

cational opportunities, of wider consultative functions, the slogans which had been raised towards the end of the war for a share in the management and control of industry and for the nationalization or socialization of industry, were taken up with greater vim and energy.³ In pursuance of these ends, labor vented its temper in a world strike movement which for scope and intensity had never been witnessed before.

2. The Main Currents

Merging in various ways in different countries, the currents of agrarian, industrial, and social unrest formed large movements which spread over wide areas. In Eastern and Southeastern Europe, combined labor and agrarian movements aimed at the redistribution of land among the peasantry and at the seizure of political power by the industrial workers. In Central Europe, the upheaval centered around the struggle for the establishment of workers' republics and for the socialization of industry. In Italy, it followed lines leading to a complete socialist revolution, on the Russian model. In the Allied and neutral countries of Western and Northern Europe, as in the United States, the unrest

³ The concept of nationalization underwent a transformation as a result of the experience with war-time state collectivism and with the revolutionary experiments of Russia and Germany. The demand was now for such forms of nationalization in which the powers of the state were at a minimum, while the functions of the workers were widened.

assumed the form of large strikes, partly industrial and partly political in character. In the larger South American Republics, it exploded in mass and general strikes which at times assumed the character of uprisings without any very clear objectives.⁴ In Japan, it expressed itself in food riots, in movements for political democracy, and in the formation of a larger labor movement. In the Near East, in India, and in China it burst forth in new movements for national self-determination.

3. Reconstruction or Revolution

From the point of view of the possible outcome of this upheaval, two questions were of importance. One was the international co-ordination of the unrest in the separate countries. It was clear that the economic and political problems which were causing the post-war upheaval could be met only by concerted action of the principal countries of the world. The other was the question of leadership. In the various countries, the masses of labor were torn between the new factions and groups which had arisen since 1914—the “Right,” “Center,” and “Left,”—socialists, communists, trade unionists, syndicalists, and others, who were fighting among themselves over the issue whether the upheaval should be turned into channels of “Reconstruction” or of “Revolution.”

⁴ For developments in the United States and in Latin America, see Chapters XI and XII.

II. "AMSTERDAM'S" LEADERSHIP

As in the separate countries, so also internationally, three groups made a bid for leadership in co-ordinating and guiding the movement of unrest. The first on the scene were the socialists, who in Bern, in February, 1919, attempted to revive the Second International. The communists followed, with the formation in March, 1919, at Moscow, of the Third International. The trade unionists got their forces together in July, 1919, with the reorganization of the I. F. T. U. at Amsterdam. These three Internationals were called, after their place of origin, the Bern International, the Moscow International, and the Amsterdam International; in current discussion they were usually referred to as "Bern," "Moscow," and "Amsterdam."⁵

Of the three Internationals, "Amsterdam" loomed up as the leading organization. For a few months after its constituent congress, its affiliations remained nominal, dues came in slowly, and the Bureau was dependent on the financial and moral aid of the Dutch trade unions. But by 1920, these difficulties were overcome, and "Amsterdam" emerged as the spokesman of over 23 million organized workers in 22 countries. Its budget was running into tens of

⁵ A fourth International, namely the International Federation of Christian Trade Unions, was beginning to reconstitute itself during 1919, but was not formally established until June, 1920. Its general effort was to try to allay industrial unrest.

thousands of dollars.⁶ It had well appointed headquarters and a regular staff, and its Bureau was eager to act in the spirit of the new rules which called for "wide activities of general interest to trade unions."

1. The Washington Conference of 1919

"Amsterdam" scored its first success in connection with the International Labor Organization. In accordance with the Treaty of Peace, the first annual conference of the International Labor Organization under the League of Nations was to convene in Washington, in October, 1919.⁷ The Inter-Allied Supreme Council was reluctant to invite the trade unions of Germany and Austria to the conference. Thereupon the Amsterdam Bureau, by letter and interview, threatened that not a single worker's delegate would go to Washington. Though in somewhat uncertain terms, invitations were at last issued.

When the first International Labor Conference met in Washington, from October 29 to November 29, 1919, the I. F. T. U.⁸ was pleased with its proceedings. The conference revealed to the world the new status which labor had achieved and the importance which problems of labor were acquiring

⁶ From July 1 to Dec. 31, 1919, affiliation fees amounted to about \$11,500; while for 1920, they totaled about \$41,000.

⁷ See Chapter VIII, p. 194.

⁸ The terms "Amsterdam" and I. F. T. U. are used interchangeably in this and subsequent chapters.

in international life. There were delegates from 41 countries. Though 14 countries had sent only government delegates, though American labor was not represented because of the failure of the United States Senate to ratify the Versailles Treaty, and though Austrian and German delegates were absent, because of delay in issuing invitations to them, and because of passport and financial difficulties—none the less “Amsterdam” spoke at the conference for the workers of all countries. Its affiliated members were treated as the recognized spokesmen of the workers of their respective countries, and they achieved a degree of discipline and solidarity among themselves which “aroused the astonishment of the government delegates and the envy of the employers.”

The Washington conference formulated Draft Conventions on the eight-hour day, unemployment, employment of women and children, and the prohibition of white phosphorus in the manufacture of matches. Though the demands of labor were not fully incorporated, these Conventions were far in advance of existing regulations. The leaders of “Amsterdam” pointed with especial pride to the Convention on the eight-hour day which symbolized the victory of an idea for which organized labor had battled for half a century.

The Washington conference gave “Amsterdam” the impetus which it needed to overcome its first difficulties. At the same time, “Amsterdam” was

strengthened by the rapid re-establishment of the International Trade Secretariats. In less than a year, the pre-war Trade Secretariats were reorganized, and several new ones were started. In the reorganization of some of these Secretariats, the initiative was taken by the organizations themselves; in others the Amsterdam Bureau supplied the initial impulse.

2. The Hungarian Boycott

Encouraged by these successes, the Amsterdam Bureau threw itself into a number of varied campaigns. In the fall of 1919, it issued an appeal to the trade unions for "mass action" to "raise the blockade" of Soviet Russia. In the winter months of the same year it shipped carloads of food donated by the workers of Belgium, France, England, Holland, and the Scandinavian countries to the people of Vienna. In February, 1920, it sent out to its affiliated bodies a circular entitled "Propositions Concerning Socialization," which pointed out the rôle of the trade unions in a socialized economy. Five special commissions were sent out to investigate economic and political conditions in the Ruhr, in the Sarre Basin, in Northern France, in Austria, and in Upper Silesia. In April, 1920, at the time of the first meeting of the Inter-Allied Supreme Council at San Remo, the Bureau got busy drafting a plan for the reconstruction of Europe, and issued a proclamation calling upon the workers to "focus

their efforts" on the socialization of the means of production as the only means of restoring peace, prosperity and democracy. A little later a manifesto was issued as a May Day proclamation, calling for a general strike to achieve the socialization of production and ending with the appeal: "Down with Reaction! Up with Socialism!" When the French government threatened to dissolve the French Confederation of Labor for following this appeal, the Bureau sent a protest which became the subject of an interpellation in the Chamber of Deputies.

More audacious was the boycott which the Bureau carried on in the summer of 1920 against Hungary. Sometime in the spring of 1920, the socialists and trade unionists of Hungary appealed to the I. F. T. U. for financial assistance and for the intercession of the Entente governments on their behalf against the regent Horthy. The Bureau of the I. F. T. U. decided to try its powers of coercion. On March 5, 1920, it issued a manifesto to the organized workers of all countries setting forth the necessity of the boycott and calling upon the transport workers, railwaymen, and post office employees in particular to hold themselves ready to act upon a signal from the Bureau. Letters specifying the demands of the I. F. T. U. for the "restoration of civil rights" in Hungary were then dispatched to Horthy and to the Inter-Allied Supreme Council. As these remained without reply, the Bureau noti-

fied the affiliated trade unions that the boycott was to commence on June 20, 1920. On June 1, the executive committee of the International Federation of Transport Workers endorsed the plan, and instructed its members that no goods destined for Hungary after June 20 should be "loaded, discharged, or transported."

The boycott lasted seven weeks. It was strictly adhered to by the trade unions of Austria; and was observed partially by the workers of Germany, Czechoslovakia, and Italy. The boycott caused inconvenience to the people of Hungary and, to a considerable extent, cut off communications between Budapest and the outside world. On August 8, 1920, the boycott was called off without having obtained its object. It was thus written down as a failure. The reasons for its failure were the political support of Horthy by the Allied governments, the divisions among the workers, and the intercession of the Hungarian trade unionists themselves who asked the I. F. T. U. to call the boycott off because of an unofficial agreement made by them with the Hungarian government.

3. The Polish Embargo

While carrying on the boycott against Hungary, the I. F. T. U. undertook to co-ordinate the movement to stop the Russo-Polish War of 1920, by means of an embargo on munitions destined for Poland. In this it had the support of the Inter-

national Transport Workers' Federation, of the British Joint Committee of Action (representing the Labor Party and the Trade Union Congress), of the German Federation of Trade Unions, the German Socialists, and the Czechoslovak Federation of Trade Unions. French, Austrian, Dutch, Italian, Swedish, German, Czechoslovakian, and Belgian workers and some I. W. W. workers in the United States participated in the embargo. Troops had to be used at Danzig to replace workers in unloading cargoes of war materials. The I. F. T. U. Bureau afterwards claimed that the embargo was largely instrumental in bringing about a speedy termination of the Russo-Polish war, and that it "frustrated the impending danger of a new world war." Though this estimate is overdrawn, the embargo was the first significant international anti-war action of labor on record.

"Amsterdam" reached its high-water mark at the special congress which it convened in London in November, 1920. Representing the only solid mass organizations in Europe—with a membership of over 23 millions in 22 countries—"Amsterdam" felt as if it were destined to play a leading part in pacifying and rebuilding Europe. With that in view, the London congress formulated a general program which called for the cancellation of all war debts, the stabilization of international exchanges, an international loan by the League of Nations for purposes of reconstruction, a reduction in paper note issues,

a capital levy, the international control and distribution of raw materials under the supervision of the International Labor Organization, the socialization of land, mines, and transport, the right of the workers to co-manage and control industry, and the abolition of "economic imperialism" and of all tariff walls. The Amsterdam Bureau was instructed to submit this program to the committee of experts who were to meet in December, 1920, at Brussels, to examine the question of reparations, and to make it the basis of a general campaign.

III. SHADES OF THE SECOND INTERNATIONAL

While "Amsterdam" was developing these activities, the Bern International was painfully struggling to hold itself together. The Commission for the Reconstruction of the International, appointed by the Bern conference in February, 1919,⁹ held sessions at Amsterdam in April, 1919, and at Lucerne in August of the same year, and summoned a congress of socialists to meet in Geneva in February, 1920. But before February it became apparent that the unity which had been patched up at Bern was going to pieces. In all the principal countries of the world, splits were taking place in the socialist parties as a result of the general upheaval, and one socialist party after another fell away from the Bern International. The Geneva congress was therefore postponed until July 31, 1920.

⁹ See Chapter VII, p. 168.

When it met, it merely revealed to what a shadow of its former self the Second International had been reduced. Seventeen "national sections" were present, but of these, five had sent delegates merely to "listen in," ten represented only fractions of the socialist movements of their respective countries. Great Britain, represented by the Labor Party, the Trade Union Congress, and the Fabian Society, furnished the main strength. The German "Majority" socialists, the Belgian, Danish, Dutch, and Swedish socialist parties, were the chief satellites.

The socialists at Geneva were animated by the desire to counteract the violent character of the world upheaval in which they themselves were in danger of being swamped, and emphasized the need and opportunity for peaceful post-war reconstruction. They reaffirmed their faith in parliaments elected by universal suffrage, and declared that socialization should proceed step by step from one industry to another, according as circumstances in each country permitted; that socialists should refrain from destroying private profit-making in any industry until they were in a position to replace it by a more efficient form of organization; and that by such a gradual process the expropriation of private property without compensation would be avoided. Instead of armed suppression of bourgeois governments by a dictatorship of the proletariat, the Geneva congress declared that it was the historic

mission of socialism not to suppress democracy, but to carry democracy to completion.

The Geneva congress reaffirmed the Bern formulas, endorsing and criticizing the League of Nations, and indicating its willingness to work with the International Labor Organization. An executive committee of three, two of whom were British, was appointed, and London was designated as headquarters. This did not, however, infuse new life into the Bern International, though its chief supporters, the British Labor Party and the British Trade Union Congress, and the German "Majority" socialists played an important part in the international events of 1919-20.

IV. THE "BOLSHEVIST ERA"

In contrast to the impotence of "Bern" and in opposition to the "reconstructive" activities of "Amsterdam," were the operations of the Third International. These had the definite aim of harnessing all the tides of unrest for the work of an immediate "world revolution." Events seemed to justify the communists' claim that Europe at least, if not the whole world, was "hurrying towards proletarian revolution at break-neck speed."¹⁰ After the Spartacist uprising in Berlin, in January, 1919,¹¹

¹⁰ Zinoviev boasted that Scheidemann would soon hang and that Lenin would help Liebknecht write the first socialist decree for Germany.

¹¹ The Spartacus Bund gained followers as a result of the disappointment of large numbers of workers with the policy of the

followed the entry of Bela Kun into Budapest in March, 1919, the proclamation of a Soviet Republic in Bavaria, in April, and the uprisings in Dresden and in other parts of Germany. Though the German Soviet republics were short-lived,¹² they were regarded by large sections of the workers of Europe as the first steps in a general movement. The struggles of the Russian Soviets against Yudenich, Kolchak, and Denikin aroused widespread sympathy, which found expression in an "international strike" on July 21, 1919, against the "Russian blockade" in which workers of many countries took part. In Europe and America, the attractive powers of the Third International were in rapid development. In some countries, the former socialist parties went over bag and baggage to the Third International. In other countries, such as Italy and Switzerland, the socialist parties expressed their solidarity with

socialist government of Haase-Ebert-Noske established on November 9, 1918. This government was at first a coalition of "Majority" and Independent Socialists. On December 29, 1918, the Independents, exasperated by the failure of the government to put through their project of socialization, resigned from the government. Some Independents and the Spartacus Bund led an uprising, early in January, 1919, to seize Berlin by force. After ten days, the insurrection was forcibly suppressed by the Socialist minister, Noske, and by Wels, the Socialist commander of Berlin. Karl Liebknecht and Rosa Luxemburg, the leaders of the movement, were assassinated on their way to prison.

¹² The Bavarian Soviets were overthrown after a few weeks' rule; the Hungarian Soviet government threatened by the Allied armies resigned on August 1, giving way to a socialist government which was suppressed by Horthy, who established the present Regency.

it. In Germany, Poland, Czechoslovakia, Bulgaria, Finland, Sweden, Holland, the United States, sections of the socialist parties broke away and formed distinct communist parties. In France, Spain, Italy, the United States, and Central and South America, former syndicalists and anarchists were ready to drop their anti-socialist bias and to throw in their lot with the new Communist International.

The revolutionary situation became more intense during 1920. General strikes in the Balkans in February, the communist uprising in the Ruhr in March, after the Kapp Putsch,¹³ mass strikes and seizure of factories in Italy in the spring of 1920, the general strike in France in May for the nationalization of the railroads, the boycott against Hungary, kept Europe in continuous turmoil. While to some observers of the European scene it seemed that Europe was "relapsing into barbarism," revolutionists were elated with the apparent imminence of a social revolution. Their hopes ran especially high during the later stages of the Russo-Polish War.¹⁴ The Russian Red Armies which, between December, 1919, and the spring of 1920, had destroyed Kolchak, scattered the forces of Yudenich, beaten back Deni-

¹³ General Kapp tried a military *coup d'état* in Berlin in March, 1920, but was foiled by a general strike under the leadership of the German trade unions and socialists. The Independent Socialist Party and the communists tried to turn this strike into revolutionary channels. The communists set up a Soviet rule in the towns of Essen, Chemnitz, and in a large part of the Ruhr basin, which they seized and held from March 20 to April 12.

¹⁴ June, July, and early part of August, 1920.

kin and cleared Russia of foreign troops and "counter-revolutionists," were marching victoriously westward, and there seemed a good prospect for their taking Warsaw, marching on Berlin, being joined by the workers of the West in a general revolutionary war to establish a Soviet Europe.

It was in the very heat of these fervid hopes, from July 19 to August 7, 1920, that the second congress of the Third International met in Petrograd and Moscow.¹⁵ Several hundred delegates from 37 countries crowded the halls of the Kremlin where the congress was held. It was a motley gathering. There were present out-and-out communists, members of the newly formed communist parties trying to follow faithfully in the footsteps of the Russian Bolsheviks. There were the "repentant sinners," such as Cachin and Frossard of the French Socialist Party, who had been ardent supporters of the war, but who were now violently swinging to the other extreme. There were delegates from the radical socialist parties, such as the socialist parties of Italy and Switzerland, which had pursued an anti-war policy during 1914-1918 and which were for revolutionary action now. There were the numerous "left-wingers," or left socialist groups, such as the Independent Socialists of Germany and the Independent Labor Party of England which had broken away from the Bern International. There were

¹⁵ One session was held in Petrograd on July 19; all other sessions were in Moscow from July 23 to August 7.

various radical and revolutionary trade union groups, such as the British Shop Stewards' Committees, the American I. W. W., the French, Spanish, and Italian syndicalists, the German Laborites who did not agree with many of the tenets of communism, but who were ready to make a compromise for the sake of immediate revolution. And there were the "first swallows" of the new era in the Orient—men of various hues and colors from Turkey, Egypt, Persia, India, China, Korea, Japan, who saw in the Third International the hope of all the "oppressed" races and nations of the world.

Swayed by these signs, the prime movers and leaders of the Third International—the Russian communists—summoned the assembled delegates to the work of "world revolution" at once. "We are living in an epoch of civil war," proclaimed the congress; "the critical hour has struck." The economic consequences of war, the complete disorganization of world economy, the "insane prices," the unlimited application of the labor of women and children, the aggravation of housing conditions, the vindictive policy of the victorious countries, were declared to be driving the workers everywhere into a "revolutionary warfare destroying objectively the foundations of the capitalist order."

On the basis of this diagnosis, the workers of the world were exhorted not to lose "an hour of invaluable time." The "communist vanguard" of all countries was called upon to "accelerate the revolution,"

without artificially provoking it. A program was adopted, the keynote of which was the need of preparing the proletariat by means of "revolutionary activities for the realization of its dictatorship." Elaborate "theses" were adopted which explained the "substance of proletarian dictatorship," analyzed the concrete manner in which it must be applied in different countries, pointed out the way in which communists should utilize parliaments, trade unions, factory committees, and other social institutions for revolutionary purposes, laid down the conditions under which Soviets should be formed, defined the communist position in the nationalist movements of the colonial countries, and the communist attitude towards the peasantry.

To promote these ends, the congress urged all those in agreement with its views to break away from the socialist parties and to form independent communist parties. The latter were to be partly legal and partly illegal organizations and were to form sections of the Third or Communist International which was to be a "single, universal" world party. The executive committee and other administrative organs of the Third International were provisionally projected on a highly centralized basis and given extensive powers.

One of the important acts of the congress was the adoption of "twenty-one points," or conditions of admission to the Communist International. In the words of the congress, the Third International was

"becoming the fashion" and was in "danger of dilution with the fluctuating and half-and-half groups which had not as yet abandoned the ideology of the Second International." The Third International was determined to keep out not only "right wingers," "social patriots," and "social chauvinists" such as Noske, Scheidemann, Renaudel, Albert Thomas, Arthur Henderson, and their like, but also the "Center" represented by Karl Kautsky, Jean Longuet, Hilferding, Friedrich Adler, Morris Hillquit and their associates. Accordingly, the "twenty-one" points were made as severe as possible,¹⁶ all groups wishing to belong to the Communist International being required to accept a strict communist program, to engage in illegal work, to carry on propaganda in the army, to remove all "reformists" from responsible positions, to submit to "iron discipline," and to form "nuclei" in all "proletarian and semi-proletarian" organizations.

Besides the socialists, the "twenty-one" points aimed also at "Amsterdam." Point ten demanded that any party belonging to the Communist International should carry on "a stubborn struggle against the Amsterdam International of the yellow labor unions," and against the International Labor Organization of the League of Nations. What the communists wanted was to break up "Amsterdam" and

¹⁶ Zinoviev boasted that the leaders of the Third International had "racked their brains in vain" to invent ten conditions more to make it more difficult to join, but their "inventive faculties could do no more."

make the trade unions a part of their own International. To carry out this plan, a number of trade unionists from Great Britain, Italy, France, Bulgaria, Yugoslavia, attending the communist congress met with A. Losovsky and G. Zinoviev and set up a Provisional International Council of Red Trade Unions.

V. THE TURN OF THE TIDE

The optimism of the revolutionists was based on what had already been achieved by the middle of 1920. In the two years of its development, the world upheaval had produced great economic and social changes. Labor in most countries of the world had won a new legal and social status, and in the victorious and neutral countries had made a great stride forward in raising wages, shortening hours, and in improving its general standard of living. Politically, labor had asserted itself as a new power. For the first time in history, there were socialist or partly-socialist governments in Germany, Austria, Hungary, Czechoslovakia, Sweden, in some of the Baltic States, in Georgia, in the Caucasus, and a communist government in Russia. In a number of other countries, labor had become the main opposition party ready to assume power at an opportune moment.

Communists claimed at the time, and have claimed since, that "Amsterdam" and the socialists prevented the workers in 1919-20 from establishing

themselves in power in Western Europe and from inaugurating a socialist reorganization of society. Putting this somewhat differently, it can be said that "Amsterdam" and the "Right" and "Center" socialists lent their efforts to prevent the upheaval from breaking down the fences and from overflowing Europe in Bolshevik fashion. "Amsterdam" and the socialists had the advantage of having behind them the solid political and industrial labor organizations, while the communists were desperately trying to build up theirs out of heterogeneous fragments. But the efforts of "Amsterdam" and the socialists would not have been successful had they not been more in harmony with the realities of the post-war situation.

That the force of the world upheaval was rapidly spending itself became clear soon after the second congress of the Third International. After their triumphant march towards Warsaw, the Red Armies were repulsed and had to retreat. In August and September, the big lock-out and strike of the metal workers in Italy, during which the Italian workers seized the factories and which threatened for a while to develop into a revolution, was settled by a compromise between the workers and the government.¹⁷ Similarly in other countries, general strikes for one

¹⁷ The Italian Socialist Party was the first important party to endorse the Third International. The Italian trade union movement pursued the same path. In April, 1920, a National Congress of Labor Unions demanded the replacement of Parliament by Soviets, while at the same time the Socialist Party was adopting

purpose or another, and attempted uprisings collapsed. On top came the economic crash which, beginning in Japan, then spreading to England and to the United States, developed before the end of the year into a world-wide industrial depression. The tide had turned.

a detailed program of social revolution. Efforts to produce a general strike began in the spring of 1920 and local seizures of factories by strikers became common during the summer. A general seizure, planned by the shop councils in July, failed through lack of co-ordination. In August, metal workers at Turin were locked out, and under the orders of the Iron Workers' Federation responded not only in Turin but in the chief manufacturing towns by hoisting the red flag over the factories and attempting to carry on production with the aid of the technical staffs. The occupation lasted only a few weeks. The government's conciliatory attitude succeeded in bringing workers and employers together to negotiate for the evacuation of the factories which was effected on September 19 in return for the promise to the workers of a share in management. During the strikes of 1920 the first clashes between strikers and Fascisti took place.

CHAPTER X

RETREAT AND CONFUSION, 1921-1923

The critical economic situation which began to develop during 1920 affected different countries in different ways and in varying degrees. France was touched by it only for a short while; the United States began to recover from it in 1922; Germany felt it hardest in 1923, with the French occupation of the Ruhr and with the collapse of the mark; Russia experienced it in the form of famine and economic disorganization which were at their worst in 1921-22. But considering world economy as a whole, it lasted to the end of 1923, being marked by a sharp falling off in world trade, by a great drop in employment, and by serious financial disorders.

In world politics, too, these years witnessed a depression—the collapse of the idealistic promises of the war. Europe was “Balkanized,” new military alliances were formed, the reparations impasse got worse, while political democracy was in retreat, along a wide line, giving way to “dictatorship,” as a recognized form of government, in Italy, Spain, the Balkans, and elsewhere.

The effect of these developments on labor was to

force it to retreat from the positions won in 1919-20. In most countries, employers resorted to widespread wage-cutting against which the workers carried on defensive strikes in vain. Standards of living were depressed by deflation in some countries, by inflation in others, and by unemployment everywhere. There was a revival of employers' movements against labor organizations and collective bargaining. The new legal institutions extending the powers of labor, such as factory committees and industrial councils, were hampered in their activities. The eight-hour day, regarded by labor as its greatest achievement of 1919-20, was disavowed by employers. Social insurance and protective labor laws were nullified in practice, if not in theory. Trade unions lost heavily in membership, and in some countries, as in Germany, were reduced by financial inflation to a mere skeleton existence. Among the masses of the workers there was a growing feeling of the difficulties in the way of socialist realization, as a result of conditions in Russia. The confidence and power felt by labor in 1919-20 gave way to hesitation, disillusionment, and, in some countries, to despair.

The international organizations of labor also had to retreat, abandoning the bold, large-scale action of 1919-20. But as these organizations did not sense the change quickly enough and either tried to stem the "tide of reaction" or to turn it to advantage by a strategy of risking all on a "lucky break," their

retreat was accompanied by much confusion and disorder.

I. THE TWO-AND-A-HALF INTERNATIONAL

The first to feel the change in the mood of labor was the Third International. Within a brief few months after its second congress it ceased to be "the fashion" with "center" and "left" socialists. The delegates of the British Independent Labor Party who had attended the Moscow congress in July and August, 1920, upon their return home, made a dark report of economic and political conditions in Russia, which dealt the cause of communism a severe blow. The leaders of the German Independent Socialists, irritated by the dictatorial manner of the Russians, and fearful that the Russian Communists were trying to "precipitate an untimely revolution" in Germany, preferred to face a split in their ranks rather than submit unconditionally to Moscow.¹ In France,² Sweden, Italy,³ the United States,⁴ and

¹ On October 12, 1920, the German Independent Socialists held a special congress at Halle to consider affiliation with the Third International. The congress resulted in a split. The elements which were for immediate and unconditional acceptance of the "twenty-one points," broke away. In December, 1920, these elements joined with the Communist Party of Germany to form the United Communist Party of Germany.

² The French Socialist Party had decided at its conference in February, 1920, at Strasbourg, to leave the Second International. The decision to affiliate unconditionally with the Third International was taken on December 25, 1920. But a minority, under Jean Longuet, Leon Blum, and Paul Renaudel, refused to submit.

³ In Italy, three tendencies manifested themselves in the Socialist Party at this time. At one extreme were the "opportunists,"

other countries, the communists also failed to carry either the majority or an important minority of the "center" and "left" socialists, splitting these parties in the process.

By the beginning of 1921, the reaction of the "center" and "left" socialists against the Third International assumed an organized character. In February, 1921, 80 delegates representing "center" and "left" socialist parties and groups in 13 countries, with an alleged following of 10 million members, met in Vienna and formed the International Working Union of Socialist Parties, which became known as the Vienna Union, or the Two-and-a-Half International, because of its intermediate position between the Second and Third Internationals. The Vienna Union disclaimed the rank of "International," asserting that its object was merely to pre-

who were willing to join the Third International, but who demanded that the "twenty-one points" be applied to each country in accordance with local conditions. At the other extreme were those led by Bordiga, who insisted on an unconditional acceptance of the "twenty-one points" and on the expulsion of the "opportunists" from the party. In between these two factions were the "unitarians" under the leadership of Serrati, the bulk of the party, who were for joining the Third International, adapting the "twenty-one points" to Italian conditions, and for keeping the unity of the Italian Socialist Party. At the national congress in Leghorn, in January, 1921, the "opportunists" and "unitarians" carried the day. The "pure" communists then seceded and formed the Communist Party of Italy.

⁴ A "left wing" of the Socialist Party of America had already broken away in 1919 and had become split up into a Communist Party and a Communist Labor Party. In 1920-21, the Socialist Party was deserted by those elements which favored the unconditional acceptance of the "twenty-one points."

pare the ground for an International in the future. Its plea was for a flexible policy which would "not restrict the proletariat to using democratic methods only, as is done by the so-called Second International, nor prescribe the mechanical imitation of the methods of the Russian peasants' and workingmen's revolution, as the Communist International would like to do."

II. DEFENSE AND ATTACK

1. The "Nep" in Russia

While losing support abroad, the Russian communists were confronted by threatening developments at home. Their very success in ending the civil war, and in reuniting the main elements of the old Russian Empire, brought to the surface a desire for relief from the political pressure and economic anguish which Russia had suffered during 1918-1920. In March, 1921, the garrison of Kronstadt, "the bulwark of Bolshevism and the pride of the Revolution," rose in revolt demanding a reform of the political dictatorship and "freedom of trading." Though the communists suppressed the Kronstadt rebellion with a ruthless hand, they had to pause and to consider its serious character, as a symptom of the economic and psychic exhaustion of the country.

Using the Kronstadt rebellion as a whip, Lenin forced through a drastic change in economic policy. The requisitioning of grain, which had been the pol-

icy since 1918, was abolished and superseded by an agricultural tax, and private trade within the country was made legal.⁵ This change, promulgated as the new economic policy—the NEP—had the object of giving Russia a much needed economic respite.

2. The “March Putsch” and “Black Friday”

Close upon the heels of the “Kronstadt rebellion” came the “March Putsch” in Germany. In the early months of 1921, the United Communist Party of Germany, under the leadership of Paul Levi, Clara Zetkin, E. Daumig, and A. Hoffman, was the largest and strongest communist party outside of Russia. Compared to it, the Communist Labor Party of Germany,⁶ which was semi-syndicalist in character, was but a small and unimportant body. Nevertheless, the executive committee of the Third International which was then still hoping to win over the syndicalist groups of the various countries, declared the Communist Labor Party a “sympathizing member” of the Third International, having the right to be represented on the executive, though not to vote. The United Communist Party protested against this procedure. The quarrel became complicated by other matters, especially by the attitude of the Third International towards Italy, and the executive

⁵ For the details of NEP see pp. 341-346.

⁶ Founded in 1919, the Communist Labor Party was for dual unions, and organized the General Workers' Union in opposition to the German Federation of Trade Unions.

committee of the United Communist Party of Germany resigned in a body.

A new executive committee came in, and at once adopted new tactics. Taking advantage of a strike situation, during which the German government sent troops into the industrial districts of Central Germany, it issued a call for a general strike. Factories were seized by communists in Essen, Dusseldorf, Muenster, Halle, Hamburg, and other places, and held for a few days. Banking on widespread discontent among the workers, on the excitement produced by the plebiscite in Upper-Silesia, and on the nationalist feelings aroused by French policy in the Rhineland,⁷ the communists on March 21, 1921, followed up their general strike by a call to arms. Both the strike and the attempted "putsch" (uprising) were a failure, as the mass of the German workers under the leadership of the trade unions, of the "Majority" and Independent socialists, did not respond. The "Putsch" resulted in bloodshed and aggravated the internal dissensions in communist ranks.⁸

Another event which came soon after and which, though not directly connected with the communist movement, affected it indirectly, was "Black Friday" in England. On April 1, 1921, the day after the

⁷ On March 31, 1921, French armies occupied Ruhrort, Duisburg, and Dusseldorf.

⁸ Paul Levi published a bitter attack on the communist leaders in a pamphlet entitled "Wider den Putschismus" for which he was expelled from the party. Levi rejoined the German Independent Socialist Party in March, 1922.

British government relinquished its war-time control over the mining industry, the British Federation of Miners declared a general strike in the industry in the hope of preventing a wage cut. The miners were depending for aid on the railway and transport workers, with whom they had formed a "Triple Alliance" for mutual assistance in case of strikes. "Critical days" followed when it looked as if Great Britain would be thrown into a general strike. But on Friday, April 15, 1921, a break occurred between the Miners' Federation and the other members of the "Triple Alliance," and the railwaymen, transport workers, and other trade unions which had joined them declared that they would not strike. This failure of the "Triple Alliance" had a bewildering and depressing effect on organized labor not only in Great Britain, but throughout Europe.

3. "To the Masses!"

It was with these developments in the background and with the specter of famine on the horizon in Russia, that the third congress of the Third International met in Moscow in June, 1921. Lenin struck the keynote of the congress with an admission that "revolutionary developments had slowed down," and that the communists had been mistaken in 1919-20 when they believed that they could win with the support of only a minority of the organized workers. Taking its cue from Lenin, the congress approved the NEP in Russia and the new Soviet policy of

making trade agreements with foreign countries and of giving concessions to foreign capital, justifying this policy as a necessary "temporary retreat" and as a method of making "capitalism serve the cause of the proletarian revolution."

In accordance with this evaluation of the world situation, the congress threw out a new slogan for the communists of all lands: "To the Masses!" In politics, this slogan meant that the policy of splitting the socialist parties was to be continued in order to consolidate the newly formed communist parties. But in all other spheres, the communists were to remain within existing organizations, and to win the masses by building "cells" or "nuclei." Special efforts were to be made to gain control of the trade unions and of other purely labor organizations, from "works councils to sport clubs and musical circles."

4. The R. I. L. U.

Immediately after the communist congress, a "world congress" of trade unionists was held in Moscow. It was opened on July 3, 1921, with 220 delegates from 42 countries in attendance. These delegates represented separate unions, some national federations, factory committees, shop stewards' committees of England, American I. W. W., syndicalists, and various "revolutionary minorities." Prominent among the delegates were Tom Mann of England, W. D. Haywood and William Z. Foster of America, Rosmer and Monatte of France; the guid-

ing spirits were the Russians, A. Losovsky, Tomsky, Dogadov, and Andreev.

There was acrimonious debate at the congress, especially on two points. One was raised by the delegates of such groups as the American I. W. W. and the German Labor Communists who were for breaking up the old trade unions and for forming new ones. Such procedure was rejected, and the congress pronounced itself in favor of remaining within existing labor organizations and of "boring from within" with a view of "capturing" them.

The other point was that of the relations between the trade unions and the Communist International. The Russians, and with them communists of other countries, favored uniting both trade union and political organizations in one single International. But the French syndicalists led a vigorous opposition to this plan. The syndicalists, reviving their pre-war philosophy, would not subordinate trade unionism to a political organization. Besides, the syndicalist delegates to the congress were aroused by the fact that the Russian communists had been shooting and jailing anarchists and syndicalists in Russia.⁹ To placate them, the communists agreed to a compromise.¹⁰ by which a separate trade union

⁹ The French and German syndicalists and the American I. W. W. were greatly influenced in Moscow by Emma Goldman and Alexander Berkman, who by this time had become unfriendly to communist rule in Russia.

¹⁰ The communists regarded the syndicalist ideas as "archeological antiquities."

International under the name of the Red International of Labor Unions—the R. I. L. U.—was formed, but an “organic connection” with the Third International was secured by providing representation from each of these Internationals upon the executive committee of the other.

The general program adopted by this first congress of the R. I. L. U. coincided with the aims of the Communist International. In purely industrial questions, the congress called for the conversion of craft unions into industrial unions, for the amalgamation of unions, for the establishment of works councils with wide powers of control, and for “class struggle” through trade union action.

The directions were for the communists to “participate in all the details of the daily struggle.” Communist “nuclei” in the labor organizations were to use all methods: parliamentarism, collective bargaining, strikes, demonstrations; but always with the understanding that such methods were merely a means of stimulating class-consciousness, of “capturing the masses,” and of overturning the old leadership of the unions. While the communist “nuclei” were pursuing these aims in separate countries, the R. I. L. U. was to conduct an attack internationally against “Amsterdam.”

5. “Amsterdam” and Reparations

At first, “Amsterdam” was inclined to take the trade union activities of the Third International

lightly. It branded the Provisional Council of Red Trade Unions as "bluff and humbug," and continued to invite the Russian trade unions to join the I. F. T. U. But as the R. I. L. U. began to attract to itself a few affiliations in Europe, the I. F. T. U. decided to adopt a more vigorous policy against it. In May, 1921, the Management Committee of "Amsterdam" ruled that "any organization which announced its affiliation with the political trade union Moscow International placed itself outside the I. F. T. U." Not only national centers, but the International Trade Secretariats were instructed to conform to this rule. As a result, "Amsterdam" lost the national centers of Finland, Latvia, Jugoslavia, and Bulgaria, which joined the R. I. L. U.

In addition, "Amsterdam" experienced during these months losses which were due to internal divisions. Shortly after the London congress in November, 1920, W. A. Appleton resigned as president of the I. F. T. U. because of his displeasure with what he termed the "ridiculous" conduct of "Amsterdam" during the summer of 1920. Appleton's resignation signified the exit of the General Federation of British Trade Unions from "Amsterdam." The British Trade Union Congress now became the sole spokesman of British labor in the I. F. T. U., and Appleton was succeeded by J. H. Thomas, of the British Railwaymen's Union. Appleton's resignation was thus of little importance in so

far as England was concerned, but because of Appleton's close affiliation with Gompers, it had some influence in America, hastening the exit of the A. F. of L. from "Amsterdam," in the spring of 1921.¹¹

Though troubled by these splits and by political and economic depression, "Amsterdam" did not modify so much its program as its tactics. Being still the largest and most united labor body, while socialists and communists were split up, it continued to carry on large policies, though relying more and more on appeals to public opinion and to the League of Nations. During the early months and spring of 1921, as the reparations issue was becoming more tense, the I. F. T. U. held a series of meetings whence issued a stream of advice and recommendations, in line with the London resolutions¹² and at which the program of the I. F. T. U. was fully elaborated. According to this program, the reconstruction of the devastated areas was indispensable and it was legitimate to demand reparations, but compulsory measures were condemned as undesirable and ineffective. "Amsterdam" urged fraternal co-operation by nations and suggested an impartial investigation and, if necessary, arbitration to determine the amount of damages and the capacity of the debtor to pay. It also demanded that Germany be admitted to the League of Nations; and that the

¹¹ See Chapter XI, p. 261.

¹² See Chapter IX, p. 208.

Allies set up an International Reconstruction Office which should be empowered to raise world loans guaranteed by the League of Nations, interest and principal to be paid by Germany. An important feature of the I. F. T. U. reparations plan was the liquidation of a large part of Germany's obligations through deliveries in kind and through labor services in the devastated areas.¹³

III. UNITED FRONTS

To advance the campaign for its reparations program, the I. F. T. U. turned to the socialists for co-operation. In April, 1921, a joint conference between the I. F. T. U., the Second International, and the Vienna Union to discuss reparations was projected, but it had to resolve itself into three separate conferences because the Vienna Union refused to meet the Second International. In October, 1921, the Vienna Union suggested a joint conference with the Second and Third Internationals, but again the project failed, this time because the Second International refused to meet the communists. Relations between the various socialist and trade union groups had been becoming more bitter all through the spring and summer of 1921, owing to the tactics of the commu-

¹³ Under the Wiesbaden agreement between the German and French governments in October, 1921, a limited amount of such work was contracted for and carried out by the building trade unions of France and Germany under the supervision of the International Union of Building Trades Workers.

nists in the trade unions and to the splits which resulted in the labor movements of the various countries.

But before the year drew to an end, the idea of combining the forces of all the international labor organizations for common action was brought up again, this time by the Russian communists. Floundering in a quagmire of economic disorganization, the Soviet government was pinning its hope at this time to the plan of the Allied governments for a general economic conference which would examine reparations, European reconstruction, war debt settlements, and Russia as interrelated aspects of one problem of world reorganization. It was clear to the Russian communists that they would strengthen their position at such a conference, if they were assured of the support of socialist and "reformist" labor. Accordingly, in December, 1921, at the meeting of the executive committee of the Third International in Moscow, they proposed a policy of co-operation with all socialist and labor organizations, which they summed up in the phrase "United Front."

After the Allied Prime Ministers' meeting at Cannes¹⁴ issued a call for a general economic conference to be held in Genoa, the socialists and communists took definite steps to meet each other.

¹⁴ The Cannes Conference which was held from the 6th to the 13th of January, 1922, adopted the agenda for the conference at Genoa.

From January 25 to February 27, 1922, delegates from the socialist parties of Germany, Austria, Belgium, France, and England, belonging to the Second and to the Two-and-a-Half Internationals, formulated a reparations policy which was essentially that of "Amsterdam." This was the first time the Second and Two-and-a-Half Internationals had agreed on common action. At the same time, from February 24th to March 4th, the enlarged executive committee of the Third International met at Moscow, and in the face of bitter opposition from French, Italian, and Spanish communists and syndicalists, approved the policy of the "United Front" and accepted the invitation of the Two-and-a-Half International for a general conference.

1. The Meeting at Berlin

Accordingly, from April 2 to April 5, 1922, 47 delegates and substitutes, representing the executive committees of the Second, Two-and-a-Half, and Third Internationals met in Berlin to consider a common program of action, in view of the approaching Genoa conference. A committee of nine, three for each International, was formed to carry on negotiations.

Three stumbling blocks had to be cleared before the conference could come to an agreement. These were the "cell-building" tactics of the Third International; the treatment of socialists by the Soviet government in general and the danger of a death

sentence for a group of Social Revolutionists then up for trial in Moscow in particular; and the *coup d'état* against the Socialist government of Georgia in the Caucasus which had been carried out by the Bolsheviki.¹⁵ The Social Revolutionists and the Georgian Socialist Party both belonged to the Second International. The delegates of the Third International at Berlin were asked to pledge the Third International and the Soviet government of Russia to renounce cell-building tactics, to appoint a commission representing the three Internationals to examine the case of Georgia, to free the socialist prisoners, and to guarantee a trial for those under criminal accusation before a court of justice with rights of defense under the control of international socialism. In addition, Ramsay MacDonald wanted an assurance of good faith to counteract the manifesto of the Third International, issued in December, 1921, in which the "united front" was presented as a strategic move for strengthening communist influence.

The discussion consisted in mutual recriminations, the pot calling the kettle black. The communists claimed the right to be dubious of the "sincerity" and "good faith" of the socialists because of the latter's conduct in 1914 and because at this very conference the Second International refused to discuss the revision of the Versailles Treaty. Again, when the delegates of the Second International

¹⁵ During the latter part of 1920.

denounced the attack of the Russian Soviets upon Georgia as imperialistic, the Bolsheviks admitted that need for oil motivated their action, but retorted that the "Right" socialists had connived at mistreatment of nationalities in the Peace Treaties, had compromised on the question of autonomy in India, Ireland, and Egypt, and had played the game of the British imperialists in Georgia.

After three days of wrangling, the conference reached a compromise. The delegates of the Third International promised that the Social Revolutionists would be given an open trial with defense of their own choosing, and under the condition that in no event would death sentences be imposed. They also agreed to a joint commission to investigate Georgia. The Second International consented to the "principle that a general conference should be called as soon as possible." The Berlin conference then issued an appeal to the workers of all countries to organize mass demonstrations during the coming Genoa conference for the eight-hour day, against unemployment, for the "united action of the proletariat against the capitalist offensive, for the Russian Revolution and the resumption by all countries of political and economic relations with Russia, and for the re-establishment of the proletarian United Front in every country and in the International." The committee of nine was to continue negotiations to call a general world congress for the purpose of effecting unity.

As soon as the Genoa conference was over, having blasted all the hopes it had raised,¹⁶ socialist-communist negotiations broke down. On May 23, 1922, the committee of nine of the three Internationals met in Berlin, but disbanded without taking action. In June the trial of the 34 Socialist Revolutionists, accused of plotting against the Soviet government and against the lives of the communist leaders, was opened in Moscow, and drove the wedge between the three Internationals still deeper. Vandervelde and other socialists who were to act as counsel for the defendants, refused to accept the rules of Soviet juristic procedure and withdrew from the trial.¹⁷ The negotiations between the three

¹⁶ The Genoa conference lasted from April 10th to May 19, 1922; it was attended by 29 European states, including Russia, and five British Dominions. The United States did not participate. The Genoa conference merely added to the tenseness of the situation. The Rappallo Treaty which Russia and Germany concluded during its sessions stirred up new fears and rumors of war, while the divergence between French and British policy which it revealed clouded the political horizon. To the Russians, Genoa was a warning that for the time being they could expect little, if any, aid from Western Europe and America. While the Genoa conference was in session, "Amsterdam" called its second regular congress in Rome from April 20th to April 26th, in the hope of exercising influence at Genoa and also of counteracting the growing danger of another general conflict. The Rome congress established a permanent standing committee against war and militarism to prepare for a general strike in case of war and to carry on propaganda for the control and limitation of the manufacture of munitions and war materials.

¹⁷ On August 8, 1922, the trial ended; three defendants were acquitted, others were sentenced to prison terms of two to ten years; 14 were condemned to death, but the sentence was stayed on condition that the Social Revolutionist Party cease its terrorism and insurrectionism.

Internationals were called off formally shortly afterwards.

2. Communist "Wings"

While failing to connect with the socialist Internationals, the policy of the "United Front" caused the Third International much internal trouble. In some countries, communists interpreted it liberally, made agreements with socialists for electoral purposes, and were even disposed towards complete amalgamation with the socialist parties. At the other extreme were communists who defied the policy and would have nothing to do either with the socialists or with the "reformist" trade unions. In between were those who argued for some modification of the policy because of their reluctance to deal with socialist and trade union "traitors." In 1920-21, the Third International had had its chief internal difficulties in Germany and Italy; now, in 1922, it was the French Communist Party that was causing anxiety. Not only were the French communists quarreling among themselves and losing membership, but the leaders of the French party were ignoring the instructions of the Third International and defying its authority, accusing the executive committee of the Communist International of rash and unfounded judgments and of hasty actions. At the same time, a large element of the French General Confederation of United Labor¹⁸ was in

¹⁸ During 1920, French trade unionists who were inimical to "Amsterdam" and friendly towards Moscow formed Revolutionary

revolt against the R. I. L. U., demanding that the latter be made independent of the Communist International. Besides France, these issues were serious in the communist parties of Italy, Norway, Czechoslovakia, and the United States. The Third International thus found itself breaking up into a "Right," "Center," and "Left" wing. To complicate matters, the Russian Communist Party itself was attacked from within by a "Workers' Opposition," under the leadership of Shliapnikov and of Alexandra Kollontai, who protested against the "NEP," the "United Front," and "bureaucratic" methods, demanding a "democratic" reform of the Russian Communist party organization.

These internal difficulties were the main topic of the fourth congress of the Third International which met in Moscow in November, 1922, during the celebrations of the fifth anniversary of the Bolshevik Revolution. Against the malcontents of various countries the leaders of the Third International asserted the right of the executive of the Third International to intervene in the internal affairs of the separate parties and to make binding rules and

Syndicalist Committees to spread their views within the General Confederation of Labor, known as the C. G. T. When the C. G. T., in the summer of 1921, endorsed "Amsterdam" and forbade its members to affiliate with the R. I. L. U., the Revolutionary Syndicalist Committees called a congress in Paris, in December, 1921, and split off from the C. G. T. to form the General Confederation of United Labor, known as the C. G. T. U. A division soon appeared, however, also in the C. G. T. U. between communists and syndicalists.

decisions. The "New Economic Policy" of Russia—the NEP—was again approved and declared to be not merely "an episode," but a "stage of development through which most countries would have to pass." The "United Front" was reaffirmed as a means not for haggling with the "reformist" leaders, but for "getting the masses" for the decisive struggles which were to be expected in the near future. The "march of the revolution," it was declared, had slowed down, but had not come to a halt, and whoever said that it had was guilty of "refined opportunism." In politics, the "United Front" was to be promoted by trying to rally socialists and communists under the battle-cry of a "Workers' Government." In the trade unions, the policy of "cell-building" and the general directions formulated in 1921 were to be continued. As a concession to the French syndicalists, the congress of the R. I. L. U., which was held immediately afterward, repealed the provision for the exchange of representatives on the executive committees of the two Internationals.

3. Communists, Syndicalists, and Socialists

This, however, did not satisfy the syndicalists. On December 25, 1922, a number of syndicalist groups from France, Germany, Holland, and Sweden broke away from the R. I. L. U. and formed a separate syndicalist international under the name of the International Working Men's Association, with headquarters in Berlin. On the other hand, the

decisions of the fourth congress of the Third International alienated a number of communists. In France, Frossard, who had played a large part in converting the French Socialist Party into the French Communist Party, deserted the latter in January, 1923, in protest against the arbitrary manner in which the executive committee of the Third International undertook to settle the internal affairs of the French party, allotting positions in the party and posts in its undertakings to selected persons. Frossard carried with him some followers who organized a "Unitarian Party," which became known as the "Socialist Communist Union" of France and which was the first symptom of more divisions to come.

Undaunted by the failure of the Berlin conference and by subsequent rebuffs,^{1°} the communists made another drive on behalf of the "United Front" a few days after Poincaré's move into the Ruhr.^{2°} On January 15, 1923, G. Zinoviev, for the Third International, and Losovsky, for the R. I. L. U., addressed a letter to "Amsterdam" and to the Socialist Internationals jointly, urging common action against

^{1°} On December 10, 1922, "Amsterdam" arranged at the Hague a large "international peace congress" which brought together some 700 delegates from trade unions, co-operatives, socialist parties, and pacifist societies to demonstrate against the danger of war and the impending occupation of the Ruhr by French troops. Individual communists came as delegates from Russian trade unions and co-operatives.

^{2°} The French began to march their troops into the Ruhr on January 11, 1923.

fascism and war. On January 30, 1923, Edo Fimmen, as secretary of "Amsterdam," sent a caustic reply to "Mr. A. Lozovsky, Secretary of the so-called Red Trade Union International," upbraiding him for his "baseless insinuations and accusations" and refusing to have anything to do with him or his organization on the ground that the essential basis for common action, namely mutual confidence, was lacking.

While "Amsterdam" and the socialists refused to accept the communist proffers of united action,²¹ they were coming into closer contacts among themselves. Beginning with the summer of 1922, "Amsterdam," the Second and the Two-and-a-Half Internationals, began to meet more frequently.²² Finally aroused by the spread of fascism in Italy²³

²¹ During 1923, socialists and trade unionists pursued a vigorous policy of getting rid of communist elements. The British Labor Party rejected the application of the British Communist Party for affiliation; Serrati was expelled from the Italian Socialist Party for advocating affiliation with the Third International; William F. Dunne, an American communist, was ousted from the Portland convention of the A. F. of L.

²² In September, 1922, the main obstacle to a reconciliation between the two socialist Internationals was removed, when the German Majority Socialists and the German Independent Socialists, thrown into gloom by the assassination of Walter Ratenau and by the excesses of German Fascists, decided to bury the past and to join hands in a new amalgamated party, the United Social Democratic Party of Germany. This act of unification measured the "great retreat" of the "minority" socialists of Central Europe from the high hopes and glowing visions of 1919-20. A small minority of Independents, under the leadership of Georg Ledebour, refused to accept the decision of their party and bolted.

²³ Mussolini's "March on Rome" took place on October 22, 1922.

and by the French occupation of the Ruhr, the Second and Two-and-a-Half Internationals convened a "unity congress" in Hamburg in May, 1923. Over 400 delegates representing 43 parties in 30 countries, with a membership of some 6,700,000 belonging to the Second International and to the Vienna Union, came together and merged the two organizations into a Labor and Socialist International which was to represent from now on a unified socialism in opposition both to a violent imperialism and a violent communism. Oudegeest, as secretary of the I. F. T. U., was present at the Hamburg congress and declared that "Amsterdam" would co-operate with the new Socialist International, while "strictly preserving its equality and independence."

4. "Amsterdam" and the Russian Unions

Aroused by the rapprochement between "Amsterdam" and the socialists, the communists started a new "United Front" campaign. Taking a different line of attack, they set into motion the Russian trade unions. Several Russian trade unions made overtures to the International Trade Secretariats with a view to common action against war and fascism. And shortly afterwards, the All-Russian Council of Trade Unions addressed a request to the Amsterdam Bureau to support such plans of action.

"Amsterdam" was thus forced to consider the question of the Russian trade unions. On August 3 and 4, 1923, the Management Committee of

"Amsterdam" held a meeting and decided that it would negotiate for unity with the All-Russian Council of Trade Unions only on condition that the Russians cease their attacks on the I. F. T. U. and its leaders; that they declare their willingness to fight war and reaction in their own land; and that the All-Russian Council of Trade Unions become the "genuine mandatory" of the Russian trade unions, that is, independent of the communist party and of the Soviet government. When the executive officers of the All-Russian Council of Trade Unions, M. Tomskey and A. Dogadov, replied that they were not interested in the rules and resolutions of "Amsterdam," the Amsterdam Bureau decided to let the matter rest and broke off the correspondence.

IV. THE "SECOND WAVE OF REVOLUTION"

1. In the Ruhr

All during 1923 the attention of European labor organizations was focused upon three issues: fascism, French occupation of the Ruhr, and the danger of war. On January 18 and 19, with the French troops already in the Ruhr, the Joint Action Committee against War and Militarism of the I. F. T. U. met to consider a possible course of action. The majority felt that "effective action on the part of the workers against the occupation was extremely difficult, partly on account of the prevailing disunion and partly on account of nationalist propaganda," but agreed to consult with the German trade

union leaders, and should they so desire, to proclaim a general strike "in those industries and districts in which such a strike could be carried out with some prospects of success." After canvassing the situation, however, it was decided to abandon the idea of a general strike. Instead, the I. F. T. U. resolved to co-operate with the Second and Two-and-a-Half Internationals, to induce the governments to accept the mediation of the League of Nations, to which Germany should first be admitted with the same rights as all other Powers.

This decision was openly defended by Oudegeest, the secretary of the I. F. T. U. His arguments were that a general strike at the moment presented "almost insuperable difficulties" on account of unemployment, internal strife, and anti-labor government policy, and that public opinion would not support a general strike against the Ruhr occupation because the prevalent opinion was that Germany had not done her entire duty in forcing the industrial magnates to carry out the reparations obligations. On the other hand, Edo Fimmen, the other secretary of the I. F. T. U., wrote an article in which he lamented the failure to call a general strike under the caption "Black January." This article aroused a great deal of resentment within the Amsterdam Bureau and resulted shortly afterwards in Fimmen's resignation from the Secretariat of the I. F. T. U.

Following up its decision, the I. F. T. U. presented

to the Fourth Assembly of the League of Nations in September, 1923, a Memorandum on the Reparations Problem, setting forth the program it had advocated since 1920.²⁴ It yielded no immediate results, but it gave "Amsterdam" satisfaction that "the voice of the I. F. T. U. had made itself heard in the League of Nations." Aside from this attempt at influencing public opinion, the I. F. T. U. organized a campaign of financial aid on behalf of the German trade unions whose financial structure went to pieces after the Ruhr occupation. Some \$190,000 were collected and handed over to the German trade unions.

In contrast to "Amsterdam" and to the socialists, the Third International saw in the Ruhr occupation another opportunity for militant action. Even before troops marched into the Ruhr, namely on January 6, 1923, German, French, Czechoslovak, Italian, and Dutch communists met at Essen to plan a concerted move against "Cuno on the Spree and Poincaré on the Ruhr."²⁵ On January 28, the German Communist Party, at a congress at Leipzig, protested against the policy of passive resistance and called upon the United Social Democratic Party to join forces in order to establish in Germany a "Workers' Government."

Failing to agree with the socialists, the commu-

²⁴ The Memorandum was submitted by Professor Gilbert Murray.

²⁵ The French deputy, Marcel Cachin, was arrested for taking part in this conference and indicted for treason. He was acquitted in June, 1923.

nists proceeded on May 24, 1923, to organize a general strike in the Ruhr and seized Gelsenkirchen and Bochum, two Ruhr towns, which they held for a few days. The communists exercised influence over the workers through the Works Councils, the Central Committee of the Works Councils of Germany being the particular lever for their activities. On August 11, 1923, the German Works Councils held a special congress and called a general strike. For several days there were riots throughout Germany which were instrumental in forcing the fall of the Cuno government. Though the Central Committee of the Works Councils was suppressed on August 17 by the newly formed Stresemann government, of which the United Socialist Party was part, the communists continued their aggressive tactics, organizing extra-legal "food-control committees" and armed "factory guards."

2. In the Balkans

By this time, it appeared to the leaders of the Third International that the struggle in Germany was not local, but a phase of a general situation. As Zinoviev phrased it, Europe was heaving with "a second wave of revolution." Widespread strikes, industrial and political in nature, were going on in many countries, often in open disregard of the advice and orders of trade union leaders, and under communist guidance. Such strikes were taking place among the dock workers of England, the textile and metal workers of France, and on an especially large

scale in Czechoslovakia and in Poland. An especially acute political and economic situation had been created in the Balkans with the assassination of Stambolisky,²⁶ the Premier of Bulgaria, who had maintained for several years a personal dictatorship with the support of the small peasants and farm laborers organized in the Agrarian Party. The Tsankoff government, which came to power after the *coup d'état* of June, 1923, represented the urban, financial, and industrial interests of Bulgaria, and allied itself with the Bulgarian socialists in order to consolidate its power. On September 12, 1923, the Tsankoff government arrested many communists on the charge that they were corresponding with the Third International and plotting against the government. An uprising followed on September 21, in which agrarians and communists joined forces. Soviets were organized by communists in many villages in northern Bulgaria. Though the communists and peasants were defeated by the government troops and police within a week,²⁷ the situation in the country continued to be tense.

3. The Hamburg Uprising and the "October Retreat"

Viewing these developments as evidence of a revolutionary revival, the leaders of the Third International approved the plan of an armed uprising in

²⁶ June, 1923.

²⁷ Thousands of communists were arrested, several of the leaders were executed, while many others suffered long term imprisonments.

Germany. Karl Radek was sent to Germany by the Third International as adviser to the German communists. A successful outbreak in Germany, according to the plan, would have thrown Eastern and Central Europe into upheaval again, resulting in a general crisis for which Soviet Russia was to hold itself in readiness.

On October 23, the communists of Hamburg gave the signal by declaring a general strike, starting food riots, and attempting to seize the city government.²⁸ But the undertaking proved an immediate failure. The Hamburg communists were quickly suppressed, while the rest of Germany failed to take the cue from Hamburg. Again, as in 1921, the masses of the German workers followed not the communists but their trade union and socialist leaders. And, as in 1921, the communist forces were weakened by internal dissensions. The "October uprising" was sponsored by the "Left wing" of the German Communist Party. But there was a "Right wing" also, led by Brandler and Thalheimer, who advised against an uprising and who won over Radek to their side. Thus, at the critical moment, there was a divided leadership.

A few days later, on October 29, government

²⁸ In Saxony and Thuringia, the communists joined with the Socialists who in these provinces were of a more militant type, to form workers' governments. It was part of the communist plan to arm the workers of Saxony for an attack on the German Fascists who under the leadership of Hitler and Ludendorff, were organizing an uprising in Bavaria.

troops from Berlin marched into Dresden and forced the Socialist-Communist government of Saxony out of office. Thousands of communists were arrested throughout Germany during the weeks which followed, and communist papers were suppressed. On December 8, the Reichstag conferred dictatorial powers upon the government and upon President Ebert to deal with the situation.

For some time afterwards, Zinoviev and other leaders of the Third International continued to maintain that the October uprising had had a good chance of success, and blamed Radek and the German "Right wing" communists for the failure. But they had to admit that the October events marked a retreat for the Third International. In perspective, the October failure of communism in Central and Eastern Europe appears as the low-water mark of the general post-war retreat of labor.

CHAPTER XI

WASHINGTON, AMSTERDAM, AND MOSCOW, 1919-1924

From 1914 to 1919, the American Federation of Labor, having hitched its wagon to the political star of President Wilson, reached out for leadership in the international labor movement. In the ambition to achieve this leadership it was frustrated by the shrewd rivalry of European labor. But as represented by Samuel Gompers, the A. F. of L. played a historic part in creating the International Labor Organization of the League of Nations and in helping to re-establish the International Federation of Trade Unions at Amsterdam.¹

After 1919, the A. F. of L., following the general trend of American foreign policy, found itself drifting away from European labor. In fact, from 1919 to 1923, American-European labor relations were far from friendly. On the other hand, during these same years, the A. F. of L. tried to build up under its own hegemony closer relations with the labor organizations of Latin America.² Only in 1924, did the A. F. of L. turn a more friendly countenance towards

¹ See Chapter VIII.

² See Chapter XII.

European labor, though continuing to cultivate more specially its Pan-American interests.

In both ways, by its attitude towards Europe and by its activity in Latin America, the A. F. of L. exercised an important influence on the course of international labor events. Post-war international labor history would, therefore, be incomplete without a sketch of the relations of the A. F. of L., first with the organizations centering in "Amsterdam" and "Moscow" and then with those of Latin America.

I. AMERICAN MISGIVINGS

When Gompers and other American delegates to the Amsterdam congress of July 29-August 2, 1919,³ left for home, they carried away mixed feelings about the reconstituted I. F. T. U. In a general way, they felt that it was important for American labor to form part of the new International and they gave a vague promise to that effect. At the same time, they had misgivings about the character of the new I. F. T. U. Still swayed by the emotions of the war, they feared the preponderance of German influence in it. More definitely, they were worried by the per capita tax which they thought too high,⁴ by the socialistic bias of the "Amsterdam" leaders, and by the new statutes of the I. F. T. U., especially by the rule according to which a simple majority vote was sufficient to make a decision binding. This rule, the

³ See Chapter VIII, p. 195.

⁴ See Chapter VIII, pp. 193-196.

Americans believed, would abrogate in practice the autonomy of the national trade union centers which article three of the statutes formally guaranteed.

II. RADICALISM AT HOME AND ABROAD

The decision on American affiliation with the I. F. T. U. rested with the convention of the A. F. of L. which was to meet in Montreal in June, 1920. During the ten months which elapsed between the Amsterdam congress of the I. F. T. U. and the Montreal convention of the A. F. of L., American labor was in a restless and expansive mood which, in much milder form, was part of the general labor upheaval the world over.⁵ American labor had strengthened its bargaining position owing to war-time prosperity, to the stoppage of immigration, and to the activities of the War Labor Board and of other government agencies; it had risen in social status because of its support of the war; and it was now out to protect the gains of the war and to extend them into the new world which was to emerge with the coming of peace. The A. F. of L. was proclaiming to the nation a "Reconstruction Program"⁶ which in addition to the familiar slogans of pre-war days, emphasized "human versus property rights" and demanded a larger place for labor in the "industrial democracy" which was said to be coming.⁷ The United Mine Workers,

⁵ See Chapter IX, pp. 197-200.

⁶ Adopted by the convention at Atlantic City in June, 1919.

⁷ The A. F. of L. derived much encouragement from President Wilson. One of his typical pronouncements, for instance, made in

then the largest and strongest single trade union in America, while carrying on a nation-wide strike for a higher wage and a six-day week, was seriously advocating the nationalization of the mines. The Railroad Brotherhoods,⁸ claiming that money changes made it impossible for labor to "win any permanent victory" in "the strife for wage increases," were clamoring for legislation nationalizing the railroads in accordance with the Plumb Plan. In most industries of the country, great bodies of workers were striking for wage increases and shorter hours, often despite the efforts of officials to restrain them. As in Europe, the membership of the trade unions was increasing by leaps and bounds, and great organizing campaigns among hitherto unorganized workers were carried on.⁹ In the political field, labor parties sprang up in many states and an American Labor Party on a national scale was being formed, in opposition to the wishes of the leaders of the A. F. of L.

By the nature of its own unrest, American labor in 1919-20 was in tune with labor movements abroad more than at any other time in its history. But in May, 1919, spoke of the "genuine democratization of industry, based upon a full recognition of the right of those who work, in whatever rank, to participate in some organic way in every decision which directly affects their welfare in the part they are to play in industry." The labor unrest of the day was dramatized to the nation by President Wilson's Industrial Conferences in the winter of 1919-20.

⁸ The Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers; the Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen; the Order of Railway Conductors; and the Brotherhood of Railway Trainmen.

⁹ The steel strike of 1919 is the outstanding illustration of this.

addition to that, its interest in international problems was stimulated by the events of the day. Because of its commitments, the A. F. of L. was deeply concerned in President Wilson's campaign for the League of Nations.¹⁰ The holding of the conference of the International Labor Organization in Washington, in October and November of 1919,¹¹ brought international economic problems nearer home to American labor. The likelihood of increased immigration from the war-wrecked countries of Europe fixed attention on the devastations of the war and on the uncertainties of peace. The maintenance of American troops abroad kept the ties between America and Europe linked in a personal way. The discussion of the Versailles Treaty agitated large groups of foreign-born workers interested in the special destinies of their native lands. Ireland and Russia loomed up particularly; the demand for Irish freedom finding a loud and officially approved

¹⁰ The report of the Executive Council to the 1919 convention held in Atlantic City, endorsed the Treaty of Versailles in the following words: "The covenant of the League of Nations, written into the Treaty of Peace, must meet with the unqualified approval and support of the American working people. It is not a perfect document and perfection is not claimed for it. It does, however, mark the nearest approach to perfection that ever has been reached in the international affairs of mankind." After lengthy debate, in which opposition was led by Andrew Furuseth, of the Seamen's Union, on grounds that the League constituted a "dangerous super-government, and that the Labor Charter had been emasculated and did not conform to American principles," the report of the Executive Council was approved by 29,909 votes to 420.

¹¹ See Chapter IX, pp. 203-204.

echo in the American trade unions, sympathy with Russia being confined largely to the radical elements of the A. F. of L. Last, but not least, those sections of American labor which had been in contact with the socialist movement before the war were now drawn into the currents of socialist-communist polemics, and were greatly aroused over the issues of the Third versus the Second International.¹² At the same time, the activities of the "Lusk Committee," the raids of the Department of Justice, and the deportations of "foreign-born agitators" cast the shadow of European social radicalism over the scene of American labor.

The officials of the A. F. of L., under the leadership of Gompers, were anxious to allay industrial unrest at home without abandoning the familiar paths of American trade unionism. They fought against the formation of an independent labor party and came out once more for a non-partisan political policy. They held to craft and trade lines in their attempts to organize new sections of the workers, as in the case of the steel workers. They tried to re-

¹² In February, 1919, there appeared a "Left wing" in the American Socialist Party. While a portion of this "Left wing" remained within the Socialist Party, most of its members broke away and joined with others to form in the fall of 1919 the Communist Party and the Communist Labor Party. During 1919-20 the American Socialist Party was in favor of joining the Third International. The two communist parties allied themselves at once with the Third International, the differences between them being differences of emphasis on methods to be used for the "overthrow of capitalism" and for the "establishment of a proletarian dictatorship" as well as the personalities of the leaders.

strain the agitation of the Railroad Brotherhoods in favor of the Plumb Plan, and while conducting a strong campaign for collective bargaining and against the inimical labor legislation of the day, they were aroused more vigorously than ever before against what seemed to them the dangerous radical elements in the labor movement.

Owing to their position at home, the leaders of the A. F. of L. were especially sensitive to any manifestations in the international labor movement which savored of "radicalism." Because of this, the misgivings with which Gompers and his associates left Amsterdam in August, 1919, became greatly aggravated during the year as a result of "Amsterdam's" activities. What Gompers had feared, seemed to be confirmed by the events which followed. To make matters worse, some of the "Amsterdam" leaders, irritated by Gompers' behavior in Europe during the winter and summer of 1919, made no effort either to conciliate the Americans or to establish better personal relations.

III. THE MONTREAL CONVENTION

Before the question of American affiliation with "Amsterdam" came up at Montreal, developments progressed far enough to render a negative decision practically inevitable. The strain in American-European relations was increased already during the Washington Conference of the International Labor Organization in October-November, 1919. Gompers

could not persuade the European labor leaders to change their position on the question of the per capita tax. While this irritated the Americans,¹³ the "Amsterdam" leaders were frank in saying that they were unfavorably impressed by much of what they saw of the American labor movement.¹⁴

"Amsterdam's" activities after the Washington Conference added to the displeasure of the A. F. of L. What capped the climax, however, was the attitude of "Amsterdam" in the matter of per capita dues. All along, the A. F. of L. leaders had been looking forward to a reduction. On March 20, 1920, the A. F. of L. forwarded to Amsterdam \$400 in part payment of the indebtedness incurred

¹³ An incident which occurred during these meetings illustrates their state of mind. On one of the several occasions when Gompers invited Bowerman, Oudegeest, Jouhaux, and Appleton to a meeting of the Bureau of the I. F. T. U. to discuss the per capita tax, only Appleton, Matthew Woll, Frank Morrison, and Gompers appeared. The other delegates had instead gone on a boat trip provided for the foreign delegates. Upon Gompers, who was disappointed by his disqualification to attend the Washington Conference of the I. L. O. because of the failure of the United States Senate to ratify the Versailles Treaty, this act of discourtesy could not but make a bad impression. Though the members of the Amsterdam Bureau who were delegates to the Washington Conference of the I. L. O. remained in Washington till December, 1919, and requested Gompers to arrange another meeting to talk matters over, Gompers failed to call such a meeting.

¹⁴ A. Thomas, the Director of the International Labor Office, wrote in *L'Atelier* in July, 1920, as follows: "When the labor delegates to the Washington International Labor Conference returned to Europe, they were unable to forego the expression of disillusionment. They discovered without effort that America is not precisely the land of liberty, at least for the working class."

towards the I. F. T. U. during the war. The A. F. of L. expected that the Management Committee, which was to meet in Amsterdam in April, 1920, would accede to the insistent American demand and reduce the per capita tax. The Management Committee, however, refused to do so on the grounds that it had no authority, and referred the question to the next congress of the I. F. T. U.¹⁵

All these matters were placed before the Montreal convention in June, 1920, by the Executive Council of the A. F. of L. for examination and a decision. The Montreal convention was in some ways "the most remarkable" in the history of American labor: it was the high water mark of the expansive movement which had begun in 1917. The membership represented was over four million; the general spirit was one of aggressive buoyancy, which found its most striking expression in the approval of the

¹⁵ In all these negotiations, Gompers and the Executive Council of the A. F. of L. were much influenced by the letters and telegrams of W. A. Appleton, President of the British Federation of Trade Unions. Appleton was out of step not only with the leaders of "Amsterdam," but also with the new leadership of the British trade unions, especially of the British Trade Union Congress. Conflicts and intrigues ensued which resulted in the demand of the British Trade Union Congress, in September, 1920, to be regarded as the sole representative of British labor, in international labor affairs. To this "Amsterdam" agreed, with the result that the British Federation of Trade Unions dropped out of "Amsterdam," and Appleton resigned from the presidency of the I. F. T. U. in November, 1920. Partly because of this personal conflict, partly on general principles, Appleton was inclined to stir up discord between the A. F. of L. and "Amsterdam," and wrote gloomy and alarmist letters to Gompers on the activities of the Amsterdam Bureau.

Plumb Plan. There seemed to be a tendency in the convention, largely as a result of the influx of new elements, to carry decisions beyond the expressed desires of the older leadership.

This, however, did not apply to international affairs. The Committee on International Relations ¹⁶ approved the "courageous, dignified manner" in which the American delegates to the Amsterdam congress in July, 1919, had "upheld the honor of our country and the soundness of our trade union movement and its policies." It agreed with the Executive Council in stressing the points upon which American labor must receive satisfaction,¹⁷ and recommended that the question of American affiliation with the I. F. T. U. be referred to the Executive Council. Its recommendations were accepted by overwhelming majorities.

While reserving decision on "Amsterdam," the Montreal convention again endorsed the Treaty of Versailles and the League of Nations, and declared

¹⁶ Matthew Woll has been secretary of this committee at every convention of the A. F. of L. since 1919.

¹⁷ These points may be summarized as follows: (1) Self-determination in political matters; (2) Abolition of all authority of the Bureau and of the Management Committee except to act on instructions of the regular congress of the I. F. T. U.; (3) Decisions to be binding only if unanimous; (4) Industrial activities in the economic field of endeavor; (5) Reduction of the per capita tax to a point that would permit the A. F. of L. to function on lines consistent with the foregoing principles. The committee laid especial stress upon maintaining the autonomy of each country to determine its own policy and to fix its own economic standards.

that "representation in the International Labor Bureau . . . (under the League of Nations) to be of the utmost importance, since work is continually in progress in which American labor has a vital interest." On the other hand, it rejected a resolution to lift the Russian blockade, on the grounds that, according to the State Department, no such blockade existed, and that no action should be taken "which could be construed as an assistance to, or approval of, the Soviet government of Russia."

IV. THE BREACH

Events during 1920-21 turned Gompers and his associates even more strongly against the European labor movements. The Hungarian boycott, the embargo on arms against Poland, the preoccupation with schemes of socialization, and the other activities of the Amsterdam International,¹⁸ were so much more fuel to the fires of irritation in the hearts of the A. F. of L. leaders. The fact that "Amsterdam" was largely carried along by tides of unrest which it could not stem, and that it tried to divert this unrest from the more revolutionary paths blazed by the Third International, did not appear clearly to the A. F. of L. leaders. On the contrary, they seemed to regard confusedly "Amsterdam," the Third International, the socialists, and all other "radicals" as of the same dangerous breed against which American labor had to be guarded.

¹⁸ See Chapters IX and X.

Such precaution seemed to them the more necessary because of the new developments in America. The severe industrial depression of 1920-21, the millions of unemployed, the "open shop" movement of employers, the avalanche of writs of injunction, the continued deportations, the slump in trade union membership, the loss of strikes, the widespread discontent of the rank and file with their leaders, opened up favorable opportunities for radical ideas among American labor. In a large number of the constituent unions of the A. F. of L., there were appearing signs of internal division along lines similar to those of Europe in the form of organizations such as "shop steward leagues," "shop councils," "One Big Union" committees, "friends of Russia," and various "propaganda leagues."

Under these influences, negotiations between the A. F. of L. and "Amsterdam," during 1920-21, merely tended to widen the breach. On June 29, 1920, Oudegeest invited the A. F. of L. to attend the special congress of the I. F. T. U. which was being convened in November, 1920, in London.¹⁹ The A. F. of L. replied that it might consider sending a delegate if all matters affecting the I. F. T. U. could be discussed—meaning constitutional changes which would more fully guarantee the autonomy of the A. F. of L. and a reduction in per capita tax. At the same time, Gompers wrote Appleton to endeavor to remove the item of socialization from the agenda and protesting against the inclusion of political ques-

¹⁹ See pp. 208-209.

tions. Appleton replied that four out of the five members of the Amsterdam Bureau were socialists and that the question of socialization could not be shelved. Oudegeest wrote to Gompers that in view of the resolution of the Montreal convention in favor of an Irish Republic, it was rather inconsistent on the part of the A. F. of L. to protest against the inclusion of political questions in the program of the I. F. T. U. Gompers was informed that the internal constitution of the I. F. T. U. could not be changed at a special congress and would have to be deferred until the next regular congress of the I. F. T. U. As a result of this correspondence, the A. F. of L. refrained from sending a delegate to the London congress and ceased further payments of dues. When Appleton resigned from the presidency of the I. F. T. U., Gompers wrote, on December 2, 1920, approvingly, and gave vent to his feelings in the following lines: "You and your British Federation are pronouncedly and emphatically trade unionists. The I. F. T. U. has become an international political body with sovietism as its logical result and a revolutionary program for 'socialization' and 'communism.' "

In January, 1921, Bowerman, of the Parliamentary Committee of the British Trade Union Congress, approached Gompers, endeavoring to bring about a reconciliation. His effort, however, was in vain. On March 5, 1921, the Executive Council of the A. F. of L. wrote to Oudegeest stating categorically that the A. F. of L. was *not* affiliated with the

I. F. T. U. for the reasons that the new constitution of the I. F. T. U. abrogated national autonomy, that appeals and proclamations had been issued committing the I. F. T. U. to a policy to which the A. F. of L. was uncompromisingly opposed, and that a system of dues entailing unbearable expense had been adopted. The specific acts of the Amsterdam Bureau to which exception was taken, included the appeal issued September 8, 1919, for mass action by means of a general strike against war, and in aid of Soviet Russia; an appeal for a general strike on May 1, 1920; inclusion in the agenda of the London congress of "socialization of the means of production." The Executive Council concluded: "The American Federation of Labor is most anxious to be part of an international trade union movement. American workers can be benefited but little, if at all, by the labor movements of other countries. But yet we shall be glad of the opportunity to co-operate and work with the toilers of all lands . . . but in so doing we must decline to be a part of a movement which undertakes the destruction of the American labor movement or the overthrow of the democratic government of the Republic of the United States. If such an International Federation of Trade Unions will vouchsafe and guarantee the autonomy and independence of the A. F. of L. and make its affiliation possible, we shall join it regardless of the policies and theories for which the various national movements may declare in their own countries."

To this letter Oudegeest responded in a petulant vein, denying that any of the alleged reasons for non-affiliation were true. Article three of the constitution, he claimed, specifically guaranteed autonomy; the various manifestoes issued by the Bureau were not regarded as revolutionary in Europe; on the contrary, they had met with general approval in working class and even "bourgeois" circles. Moreover, how could the A. F. of L. make objection to "socialization," when Gompers was honorary president of the Plumb Plan League? Oudegeest further accused Gompers of having failed to live up to his pledge of co-operation given in Amsterdam in 1919. To make matters worse, Oudegeest sent a copy of this letter to the international unions of America belonging to the A. F. of L. To this, the Executive Council replied in a resentful and caustic tone, characterizing Oudegeest's letter as an "insult," reiterating their accusations, and protesting against Oudegeest's attempt to go over their heads to the American unions.

At one point during these negotiations, Appleton made a suggestion to Gompers to form an independent English-speaking federation of trade unions. The proposal appealed to Gompers as a means of moderating the policies of "Amsterdam." John P. Frey also favored the idea.²⁰ But there were too

²⁰ Frey wrote to Gompers on April 6, 1921: "I do not like to see the A. F. of L. outside of the international trade union movement. I cannot see how we could possibly be members of the I. F. T. U. as that organization is now conducted. I am also

many complicating factors in the plan; for instance, the dominance of political and socialist elements in the labor movements of England and Australia. The idea was, therefore, not pursued any further.

The Denver convention of the A. F. of L., in June, 1921, went a little further than that of Montreal. Meeting as it did, when the industrial depression in the United States was at its severest, the Denver convention marked the highest point of the discontent which had been accumulating in the ranks of American labor since 1919. This was reflected in the reaffirmation of the more radical resolutions passed by the Montreal convention, and more dramatically in the fact that for the first time in 15 years, Gompers had a rival for the presidency in John L. Lewis, of the United Mine Workers.²¹

In regard to international relations, this spirit was shown in the more heated discussion of the Russian question and in the introduction of resolutions by delegates of the International Association of Machinists and of the Firemen and Oilers for the immediate reaffiliation with "Amsterdam." With regard to Russia, the Executive Council carried the convention which voted approval of Secretary Hughes' pronouncement that trade or extension of credit was impossible, so long as the present political or economic system of Russia continued. With a

opposed to too many international federations. And yet, I believe that an international conference of English-speaking trade-unionists would be of advantage to us."

²¹ Lewis received 12,324 votes against 25,022 cast for Gompers.

few dissenting votes, the convention also approved the Executive Council's attack on the Third International and the Red International of Labor Unions.²² But while upholding the Executive Council's stand on all points in its controversy with "Amsterdam," the convention recommended that negotiations be continued.

In accordance with the instructions of the Denver Convention, the Executive Council of the A. F. of L. dispatched a more conciliatory letter to "Amsterdam" which elicited a suggestion from Oudegeest for a personal conference to settle the differences. But before anything could be done about this, relations were again strained as a result of the Washington Conference on the Limitation of Armaments called by President Harding in the fall of 1921. The A. F. of L. was committed to support this conference,²³ but the Amsterdam Bureau was skeptical. Gompers then wrote directly to the trade union centers of England, France, and Italy, urging them to request their respective governments to appoint special labor delegates on the official commissions to the conference. The Management Committee of the I. F. T. U. resented this, and a correspondence, once more unfriendly in tone, ensued. When the regular congress of the I. F. T. U., held at Rome in

²² "Moscow," wrote the Executive Council, "is willing to spend the last gold ruble of the heritage of the Russian people for its disruptive purposes."

²³ A resolution to that effect had been passed by the Denver Convention.

April, 1922,²⁴ re-elected the Management Committee, and endorsed all the policies to which the Americans had so strenuously objected, the Executive Council of the A. F. of L. felt that the Rome congress had made it "more difficult to arrive at an agreement," and was upheld in its course by the 1922 convention of the A. F. of L. at Cincinnati.

V. A NOTE OF RECONCILIATION

Nevertheless, during 1923-24 the attitude of the A. F. of L. towards "Amsterdam" began to change. In part, this was the result of the efforts of Johann Sassenbach, the German-speaking secretary of the I. F. T. U., who replaced Oudegeest in 1923 in conducting the correspondence with the A. F. of L., and who adopted a friendly and conciliatory tone. The Executive Council of the A. F. of L. responded to the appeal of the I. F. T. U. on behalf of the German unions disorganized by the financial debacle of 1923, and issued a call to its affiliated unions to send contributions which resulted in the collection of some \$27,000.²⁵

A second more important factor in changing the attitude of the A. F. of L. towards "Amsterdam" was the increasing activity of the communists in the American labor movement. From 1919 to 1922, the American communists had been almost entirely absorbed in political issues, quarreling among them-

²⁴ See Chapter X, p. 239.

²⁵ This is exclusive of funds sent directly to Germany by individual American trade unions.

selves and with the socialists as to the exact meaning of "proletarian dictatorship," and as to the best tactics for establishing a dictatorship in the near future in the United States. In large measure the communist activities of these years were "illegal" and carried on underground, and the differences of opinion as well as personal animosities between communist leaders resulted in repeated splits and in the formation of sectarian groups which had but little contact with and still less influence on the trade unions.

With the beginning of 1922 the American communists changed tactics. They became a legal political party, having organized themselves into the Workers' Party of America,²⁶ and started out to apply the "United Front" in politics, and in the trade unions. In this new capacity, they played a considerable part in the Farmer-Labor upheaval which began with the first Conference for Progressive Political Action in July, 1922, and which culminated in the La Follette presidential campaign of 1924. In the trade unions they set out to capitalize the discontent of the workers in favor of the Third International and of the Red International of Labor Unions. This particular task was undertaken, with communist approval, by the Trade Union Educational League, which, under the leadership of William Z. Foster, began a systematic work of "bor-

²⁶ Organized at a convention held in New York, December 23-26, 1921.

ing from within" and of building up "nuclei" and "cells" in factories and in trade union organizations,²⁷ in accordance with the instructions emanating from the congresses and executive councils of the Moscow Internationals.²⁸

Between 1922 and 1924, the Trade Union Educational League made headway in a number of trade unions in the clothing and textile industries, in mining, in the machine trades,²⁹ and in some of the railroad shop crafts. In the latter, feeling ran high as a result of the wage-cutting policy of the Railroad Labor Board and of the abuse of the injunction during the disastrous strike of 1922. The other industries were highly competitive, over-developed and over-manned, and slow in readjusting themselves to the post-war situation. The trade unions in those industries had in the course of a decade and a half raised the workers to a higher industrial and social level, but were now finding it more and more difficult to hold their own. Their membership demanded much from trade unionism and, when in trouble, was ever ready to try new methods and new leaders. The Trade Union Educational League, by concentrating on the weak spots in these unions

²⁷ The Trade Union Educational League was organized in 1920 by W. Z. Foster, at one time a syndicalist, for the propaganda of "amalgamation" and of industrial unionism. Foster visited Moscow in the summer of 1921 and became a communist.

²⁸ See Chapter X, pp. 229-231.

²⁹ The United Mine Workers, the International Association of Machinists, the Fur Workers, the International Ladies' Garment Workers' Union, etc.

and by indiscriminate personal attacks on the leaders, was able to mobilize under its banners the discontented elements.

The fight against this "radical menace" broke the ice between the A. F. of L. and "Amsterdam." The leaders of the A. F. of L. saw that the struggle in the American unions was but one phase of the international conflict between communists, socialists, and trade unionists, that American communists and the Trade Union Educational League were deriving support from the international communist organizations, and that what the A. F. of L. was trying to do in America was being done by "Amsterdam" and by the Socialist International in Europe. On the other hand, the A. F. of L. leaders were becoming less concerned about, and less apprehensive of, socialism, because of the disintegration of the American Socialist Party between 1919 and 1924 and because of the readiness with which the remnants of the American Socialist Party supported the A. F. of L. against the communists.

A third factor was the realization by Gompers and his associates that "Amsterdam" might make a bid for the affiliation of the labor organizations of the Latin American countries. This was brought home to Gompers in 1924 by the activities of John W. Brown, the English-speaking secretary of "Amsterdam."³⁰ While Gompers conceived the idea of a "Labor Monroe Doctrine" as a measure of counter-

³⁰ See Chapter XII, p. 299.

attack, as described in the chapter which follows, he also saw that his policy would gain by co-operation with "Amsterdam."

In a formal way, the more friendly attitude of the A. F. of L. towards "Amsterdam" was shown at the El Paso convention of the A. F. of L. in October, 1924. For the first time since 1920, the hope was expressed that reaffiliation with the I. F. T. U. would take place in the "not distant future." On the eve of his retirement from leadership, Gompers thus sounded a note of reconciliation with European labor.³¹

³¹ Gompers died in December, 1924, in San Antonio, on his way from Mexico City to Washington.

CHAPTER XII

PAN-AMERICAN LABOR, 1918-1924

In its triangular relations with "Amsterdam" and "Moscow," the A. F. of L. was much influenced by developments in Latin America. Impelled at first to turn its attention in that direction by sentimental and political more than by economic considerations, the A. F. of L. soon discovered here what it came to regard as its special opportunity. Here was a continent with new and growing labor movements which presumably had many interests in common. If co-ordinated, these labor movements seemed not only likely to be mutually helpful, but capable of counteracting the preponderance of Europe in international labor affairs. Slowly but steadily the A. F. of L. became interested in accomplishing these two ends under its own leadership.

I. PAVING THE WAY

In a personal way, the beginnings of inter-American labor relations may be traced to the late eighties and early nineties of the past century. It was during those years that Samuel Gompers, working as a cigar-maker in New York, came into contact with

the Cuban and Mexican revolutionists who sought refuge and work in the United States, and became interested in the struggle for democratic government, as well as in the problem of trade unionism in these countries.

1. Cuba and Porto Rico

In a collective capacity, the A. F. of L. began to take an interest in the countries to the south of the United States in 1896. At a convention in Cincinnati, in that year, it endorsed the demands of the Cuban revolutionists. After the Spanish-American War, the A. F. of L. joined with those who opposed "American imperialism," demanding "freedom and independence" for Cuba and protesting against "forcing our system of government upon an unwilling people," whether in Cuba, Porto Rico, or the Philippines.

Between 1900 and 1907, the A. F. of L. made efforts to extend its influence to Cuba and Porto Rico. Santiago Iglesias and Eduardo Condé, Spanish immigrants to Porto Rico, who had been under socialist and syndicalist influence in Spain, became the leaders in organizing a trade union and socialist movement among Porto-Rican workers. Iglesias was forced to leave Porto Rico in 1900 and emigrated to Brooklyn. At the suggestion of one of the editors of the New York *Volkszeitung*, a German socialist paper, he turned to the A. F. of L. for help, and at the Louisville convention of the A. F. of L. in 1900,

presented a report on conditions in Porto Rico under American military rule, which were described as oppressive. The convention decided to start a campaign first for freedom of speech, of the press, and of assembly, for fair trials, and ultimately for a civil government; three thousand dollars were voted for the campaign.

In 1901, the Porto-Rican unions became affiliated with the A. F. of L. and Iglesias was appointed organizer on the pay-roll of the A. F. of L. In 1902, Porto Rico for the first time sent delegates to a convention of the A. F. of L. The A. F. of L. by this time was convinced that Porto Rico would become a "permanent possession" of the United States, and set out to "encourage and make easy" the "complete fraternization" of the Porto-Rican workers with "the organized labor movement of our continent."¹

2. Mexico

Between 1908 and 1914, the A. F. of L. became interested in what was happening in Mexico. For some time before that, some American trade unions had been concerned about the immigration of Mexican laborers to the border states of the Southwest and about the possible effects upon them of the extremely low wages and semi-servile state of Mexican labor. Convinced that the condition of Mexican labor was the result of the Diaz regime, these trade

¹ Gompers visited Porto Rico in 1904 and, upon his return, described vividly the conditions which he found there.

unionists expressed sympathy for the political parties or "juntas" which were fighting Diaz, especially for the Liberal Party led by the brothers Picardo and Enrique Magon, by Villareal, and others. John Murray, a member of the International Typographical Union, took up the cause of the Mexican Liberal Party with zeal and aroused Gompers' enthusiasm for it.

As a result of the team-work of these two men, the A. F. of L. was won over to the cause of the Mexican revolutionary movement. In 1908, the Denver convention of the A. F. of L. intervened on behalf of the members of the Mexican Liberal Party who had set up headquarters in Los Angeles and who had been imprisoned in that city for alleged violation of the neutrality laws. In 1910, when the revolution against Diaz was begun by Madero, under the banner of "Land and Liberty," the A. F. of L. used its influence that the American government should not intervene. After the assassination of Madero in 1913, the A. F. of L. "helped in sustaining the attitude of the American government in its refusal to recognize Huerta," and in 1914, supported Carranza.

Regardless of the friendly attitude of the A. F. of L. towards the revolutionary movement of Mexico, its relations with Mexican labor at this time were not very close. Labor organization in Mexico during these years was developing in a direction opposite to that of the A. F. of L. As in other Latin American

countries, labor in Mexico received its baptism in trade unionism from men who thought in anarchist and socialist terms. This was true of the small local unions which had appeared in a few skilled trades before 1910.² With the revolutionary outbreak of 1910, this tendency became dominant. The industrial workers who had been suppressed for 30 years under Diaz and who joined the revolution "blindly and passionately," quickly translated the meaning of the revolution as an opportunity to organize and to articulate economic and political demands. Not only were unions rapidly formed in various trades and industries, but a federation of trade unions was brought into being with the founding in Tampico, in July, 1912, of the *Casa del Obrero Mundial* (House of Workers of the World). The program of this organization embodied the doctrines of syndicalism, as developed in Spain and France and as modified by the I. W. W. in the United States, advocating direct action, the general strike, sabotage, and social revolution. Its influence was soon seen in the district labor organizations which it helped to organize in Mexico City, Yucatan, Vera Cruz, and

² The first unions seem to have been originated by railroad workers in 1904. In 1905 socialists and syndicalists began their agitation in Mexico State and in Yucatan. In 1906, the textile workers of Puebla, Vera-Cruz and of several other states, aroused by the agitation of the Magon brothers, formed trade unions and carried on one of the earliest strikes on record in Mexico. In 1908, there were unions of cigar-makers, carpenters, boiler-makers, mechanics, blacksmiths. The largest union was the Grand League of Railroad Workers which claimed in 1908 some 10,000 members.

elsewhere. The leaders of this labor movement were exiled Spanish syndicalists and anarchists and Mexicans who had been influenced by them and by the I. W. W. in the United States. For men of such antecedents, and in the midst of revolution, the A. F. of L. held no attractions.

3. South America

The same may be said of the labor movements in the South American republics. Labor relations there reflected the general international situation. The intercourse of the United States with South America before 1914 was comparatively slight; closer ties bound those countries to Europe. Their cultural affinity was with Spain and the Latin countries, their commercial and financial connections with England and Germany. Accordingly, the labor movements in those countries followed the pattern either of German socialism or of French-Spanish syndicalism. German immigrants and native intellectuals took the initiative in forming political socialist parties; immigrants from Spain, Italy, and France took the lead in organizing trade unions with syndicalist programs. In Argentina, a socialist party was organized as early as 1896 and joined the Second International in 1904; in 1914, the socialists polled over 40,000 votes. *The Federación Obrera Regional Argentina* (Argentine Regional Workers' Federation), known as the F. O. R. A. was organized in 1901, under anarchist influence, but in 1905 the

syndicalist elements broke away and formed a separate trade union federation. In Brazil, a federation of labor was organized in 1906 among German and Sicilian immigrants, while some native Portuguese formed socialist groups. Small socialist parties also appeared in Chile in 1912, and in Uruguay in 1913. None of these could have been on friendly terms with the A. F. of L., in view of the latter's attitude to socialism.

4. Labor versus "Wall Street"

With the outbreak of the World War, the A. F. of L., urged on by Gompers, was aroused to take a new and wider interest in the Pan-American situation. The war, cutting communications and the supply of credit from Europe, forced South America into closer contacts with the United States. The opening of the Panama Canal in 1915 and the beginning of wider business connections made American labor conscious of the new situation. In view of the stand which the A. F. of L. had taken in 1914 and of the new rôle which it had mapped out for itself in international affairs,³ it felt impelled to demand a larger share also in the consideration of Pan-American relations. When the Pan-American Financial Conference was called in Washington, in May, 1915, Gompers protested to the Secretary of the Treasury against the failure to include labor representatives in the conference, but to no avail. Deeply disap-

³ See Chapter VIII.

pointed, Gompers put forth the idea of a Pan-American organization of workers in opposition to that of employers. At the San Francisco convention of the A. F. of L. in 1915, he carried the convention on this point, and the Executive Council of the A. F. of L. was instructed to enter into correspondence with the Latin American labor unions, to devise plans for the exchange of fraternal delegates, and to invite representatives of Mexico, Argentina, Chile, Brazil, Uruguay, etc. to a great Pan-American labor convention to be held in Washington to consider the economic problems confronting these countries as a result of "the fraternization and combinations between Wall Street and South American capitalists."

II. CIVIL WAR AND WORLD WAR

1. Carranza and the Casa del Obrero

A favorable condition for carrying out this suggestion was created at this time by events in Mexico. During the civil war in which Huerta, Carranza, Villa, and Zapata were engaged between 1913 and 1915, the Mexican labor organizations—syndicalist as well as socialist—found it more and more difficult to maintain the neutrality which they had at first assumed. When Carranza broke with Villa, the labor leaders threw their support to Carranza. At the most critical moment when Carranza's fate was in the balance, he made a pact with the leaders of the *Casa del Obrero Mundial* promising them pro-

gressive labor legislation in return for their support. The labor leaders then hastened to the industrial centers of Mexico and raised six "Red Battalions" which helped to decide the issue in favor of Carranza.⁴

Anxious to strengthen Carranza's government, the Mexican labor leaders turned to the A. F. of L. as the representative labor body of the United States, for aid and support. Their sympathies were with the American socialists and I. W. W., but their interests led them to the A. F. of L. On the other hand, Gompers, looking at the situation in a large way and interested in his Pan-American plans, was willing to accept the radicalism of the Mexican labor movement, regarding it as an inevitable reaction against the Diaz regime.⁵

Action was precipitated by the sudden crisis in Mexican-American relations in the spring of 1916, when some American soldiers who had crossed the Mexican border were arrested by Carranza's troops. The leaders of Mexican labor, among whom were Carlos Loveira and Luis N. Morones, asked the A. F.

⁴ The pact was signed on February 17, 1915, by the leaders of the *Casa del Obrero Mundial* and by Rafael Zubaran Capmany, Secretary of State in the provisional Carranza government. The "Red Battalions" fought as military trade union units and under the banners of the trade unions of which they were composed. There were tailors' battalions, carpenters' and stone masons' battalions, typographical workers' battalions, etc. Among those who led these battalions were many "propagandists for the social revolution" from the *Casa del Obrero Mundial*.

⁵ See the "American Federationist" for August, 1916.

of L. to use its influence with President Wilson to secure the withdrawal of the American expedition. Gompers called the Mexican labor leaders to a conference in Washington. After the conference, which was held on May 23, 1916, Gompers, on his own responsibility, wired Carranza on June 28, 1916, asking for the release of the American soldiers. Carranza acceded to this request the next day, and the crisis was brought to an end.⁶ Following this successful collaboration, the leaders of the A. F. of L. and of Mexican labor met again on July 3, 1916, and agreed to co-operate in working out a plan for maintaining permanent relations and also for federating the labor movements of all the countries of the two Americas.

For a while, Mexican labor leaders were slow in living up to this pact. That was largely due to the fact that during 1916-17, Mexican labor was absorbed in a struggle with the Carranza government. After his triumph over Villa, Carranza, aroused by the numerous strikes which swept Mexico, largely as a result of the impoverishment and financial inflation caused by the revolution, turned against labor. He dispersed the "Red Battalions," prohibited strikes, and tried to suppress the *Casa del Obrero Mundial*. Carranza failed, for the Mexican labor unions not only continued to grow, but consolidated

⁶ Gompers later wrote: "Not all the members of the Executive Council (of the A. F. of L.) were in complete sympathy with my efforts to help bring about better relations between the United States and Mexico."

their forces,⁷ and profiting by the struggle of factions in the Queretaro constitutional convention of 1916-17, obtained the passage of article 123 of the Mexican Constitution, the "Magna Charta of Mexican Labor" which contains some of the most advanced protective labor provisions in the world.

2. The A. F. of L. and the C. R. O. M.

Gompers, however, pursued his Pan-American plans. On January 31, 1917, at a conference held at the offices of the A. F. of L., in Washington, a few delegates from the A. F. of L., Porto Rico, and Mexico (Yucatan), set up a permanent committee, of which John Murray was made secretary, and drafted a manifesto to all the Latin American countries. The specific objects which Gompers stressed at this time were: the maintenance of peace on the American continent, the defense of "human rights" against "imperialistic" designs, the regulation of migration, the weaning of the Latin American labor

⁷ In this consolidation one organization and one man played the chief part. The organization was the Federation of Trade Unions of the Federal District of Mexico which called the first national labor congress in Mexico held in Vera Cruz on March 5, 1916. The man was Luis N. Morones, an electrical worker, who emerged during 1915-16 as the leading member of the *Casa del Obrero Mundial*. Morones gathered about him the chief labor leaders of Mexico, until then divided by differences of theory and method, and welded them into "Grupo Acción" (Action Group) which became the controlling force within the *Casa del Obrero Mundial* and later of the entire Mexican labor movement. Among the original members of the "Grupo Acción," besides Morones, were S. O. Yudico, Edmundo Moneda, and Ricardo Trevino. The membership of the group was limited to twenty.

movements away from syndicalist tendencies to the type of unionism represented by the A. F. of L., the promotion of organization in the backward countries, and the co-operation of the Americas in defense of "American ideals" in the World War against the menace of German militarism, and against the possible menace of an anti-United States coalition of European or Asiatic nations.

When the United States entered the World War, Gompers concentrated his attention on the two objectives mentioned last. On a smaller scale, the years 1914-1917 had produced in the labor and socialist organizations of Latin America divisions similar to those of Europe.⁸ In Argentina, Chile, and Peru there were anti-war groups, while in Mexico there was a strong current of opinion favorable to Germany. A Pan-American labor organization, as Gompers saw it, could be used to counteract these anti-war and Germanophile tendencies and to create favorable opinion for the cause of the Allies.

With this in mind, Gompers corresponded with the labor leaders of Mexico and urged them to push the Pan-American plan.⁹ Mexican labor was at this time taking an important step forward in its organization. On March 22, 1918, delegates of trade

⁸ See Chapter VII.

⁹ In a letter dated March 27, 1918, Carlos Loveira wrote to Gompers that he was going to Buenos Aires to buy food for the State of Yucatan. "Of course," reads the letter, "I will make a lot of more labor propaganda, on the quiet, only with the leaders in Peru, Chile and Argentina. . . . Of course, I will also make some propaganda in favor of the Allies."

unions from 18 states of Mexico, met in Saltillo, the capital of Coahuila, and laid the foundations of the national Mexican labor federation, the *Confederación Regional Obrera Mexicana*, known as the C. R. O. M. The program adopted by this new organization was very moderate compared with that of the *Casa del Obrero Mundial*. Though advocating the ultimate ownership of industry by the workers, it laid stress for the present on agrarian reform, land distribution, and the enforcement of existing labor laws. The leaders of "Grupo Acción," who steered the Saltillo congress, Morones and Trevino, while paying homage to radical socialist ideals, were interested primarily in improving immediately the condition of the Mexican workers and peasants.

With the organization of the C. R. O. M., a more solid basis was created in Mexico for Gompers' plans. Gompers sent a labor mission composed of John Murray and James Lord to talk matters over with the Mexican leaders. At the same time, he persuaded President Wilson that Pan-American labor unity was an important war measure which would help to educate "the Mexican people as to the cause for which the United States (had) entered the World War." President Wilson appropriated from special funds several thousand dollars to promote the project, and for several months afterward John Murray and Canuto A. Vargas published near the Mexican border a bi-lingual paper (in Spanish and in English) which was shipped into Mexico in thou-

sands of copies and which advocated labor Pan-Americanism.

III. THE FOUNDATIONS

1. The Laredo Conference

Finally, two days after the signing of the Armistice, on November 13, 1918, there was brought together at Laredo, Texas, the first Pan-American labor conference. Forty-six delegates were present from the United States, representing the A. F. of L. and a number of trade unions affiliated with the A. F. of L.; 21 delegates came from Mexico representing the C. R. O. M., the *Casa del Obrero Mundial*, and various local and state labor organizations. Guatemala, Costa Rica, Salvador, and Colombia sent one delegate each. All told there were 72 delegates from seven countries. As a matter of fact, however, the lesser countries played no part except to justify the title Pan-American.¹⁰

The conference opened with a flourish of brotherly cordiality. An "international celebration" was held on the bridge between Mexico and the United States and in the plaza of Laredo. Official sanction was lent to this alliance of the labor movements by the address of Secretary of Labor Wilson, of General Garza, representing Carranza, of Governor Hunt of Arizona, and by a message of greetings from the director of the Pan-American Union.

¹⁰ Most of the delegates from these countries were political refugees residing in the United States who were assisted by the A. F. of L. to attend the conference.

However, when the conference settled down to business, "harmony" gave way to differences of opinion. Many of the Mexican delegates, representing the radical local unions, gave evidence of having come to the conference determined to play the part of equals to the A. F. of L. and to air their grievances against American unions. At the very outset, this was revealed in the unwillingness of these Mexican delegates to accept the leadership of Gompers unquestioningly. They demanded a chairman who could speak both English and Spanish. A number of nominations were made, and withdrawn by those nominated. Only after he declared that he was willing to serve but refused to "enter a competitive race," was Gompers elected by "a majority" of the delegates.

Discussion at the conference centered around eight demands which were presented by the Mexican delegates. Of these the most important were for: (1) the appointment by the A. F. of L. and by the C. R. O. M. of permanent residents in border cities and in ports of embarkation to secure proper treatment for immigrants and emigrants; (2) the extension to Mexicans of facilities for joining American unions with full privileges; (3) an agreement to exert influence to secure justice and protection to workers imprisoned in the United States; (4) the exclusion from discussion of all subjects touching upon Mex-

¹¹ The minutes of the conference have not been published, but are available in the archives of the A. F. of L.

ican neutrality in the war and upon the internal policies of Mexico or of the United States.

In connection with points one and two, the Mexicans recounted the bad treatment which Mexican immigrants into the United States were receiving from the Immigration authorities, and the discrimination practiced by American unions. These complaints were referred to the Executive Committee of the A. F. of L. for investigation and action. Point three developed into a debate on the I. W. W. Tobin, for the A. F. of L., declared that in cases where the I. W. W. had been imprisoned, "absolute justice had been done them"; Gompers denounced the I. W. W. as the "Bolsheviki of America"; Morones, although urging that even if the A. F. of L. disagreed with the I. W. W., it ought at least permit them to develop their propaganda freely, finally announced that the debate had been provoked for home consumption, because in Mexico many people had accused the A. F. of L. of permitting the indiscriminate jailing of workers.

A clash occurred also over point four, which some of the Mexican delegates had underscored as important. The committee on resolutions recommended that it be stricken out altogether because it dealt with subjects outside the sphere of the conference. But after the vote to strike out this section had been taken, Gompers demanded support for a resolution endorsing the basic principles of the Treaty of Versailles—specifically the League of

Nations, the right of national self-determination, and the Labor Convention. The Mexicans objected strenuously, but finally agreed to cast the vote for Gompers' resolution with the understanding that it was to be subject to ratification by the workers of Mexico.

Composing their differences in this way, the delegates on the fourth day of the conference adopted the report which formally organized the Pan-American Federation of Labor. The new organization was to have as its main objects the establishment of better conditions for the working people migrating from one country to another and the establishment of friendly relations between the labor movements and peoples of the Pan-American Republics. It was to hold annual congresses. Gompers was elected chairman, John Murray became the English-speaking secretary, and Canuto A. Vargas the Spanish-speaking secretary. Dues were to be paid by all affiliated organizations in proportion to membership, and the labor movement of each country was to be allowed at least two delegates to the congresses of the new federation.¹²

2. Facing the Storm

From its foundation to its third congress, held in January, 1921, the Pan-American Federation of Labor faced a condition of labor unrest in the Latin

¹² This was later amended so as to allow from two to five delegates.

American countries which was part of the world upheaval described elsewhere.¹³ There was a large increase in the membership of the older trade unions in most of these countries, and new unions sprang up in such industries as textiles and food, which took a rapid stride forward as a result of the World War. Rising prices, financial disturbances, and the general social restlessness precipitated these unions into activities similar to those which were taking place in Europe. In Argentina, Chile, Peru, and Brazil, there was a succession of mass strikes and general strikes which centered partly around the demands for higher wages and for the eight-hour day, but which assumed at times a violent and revolutionary character. On several occasions Buenos-Aires in Argentina, Callas and Lima in Peru, and the mining districts of Chile were paralyzed by general strikes and were entirely in the hands of the labor organizations led by syndicalists, anarchists, I. W. W., revolutionary socialists, and communists. To put down these strikes, the governments of these countries used troops and coercive measures, dispersing many labor unions and jailing their leaders.

In Mexico the upheaval took the peculiar form of the so-called "revindicating revolution" of 1920. This revolution was to "revindicate the principles of 1917" which Carranza was accused of trying to violate by attempting to impose on the country as his successor a man chosen by himself. It resulted in

¹³ See Chapter IX.

the assassination of Carranza and in the election of General Alvaro Obregon to the presidency. Mexican labor played a preponderant part in this revolution through the C. R. O. M., whose membership by 1920 had increased to about 300,000, and through the Partido Laborista Mexicano (Mexican Labor Party) which mobilized the Mexican workers politically in support of Obregon.¹⁴

As in Europe, so in Latin America the upheaval and reaction of 1919-1921 resulted in splitting up the labor unions between socialists, syndicalists, communists, and the combinations formed by them. In Mexico, at the second congress of the C. R. O. M., at Aguas Calientes in 1920, several recalcitrant groups of syndicalists, communists, and I. W. W. gave vent to their dissatisfaction with the moderate and governmental tendencies of the C. R. O. M. In February, 1921, these groups combined to form the *Confederación General de Trabajadores*, the General Confederation of Workers, known as the Mexican C. G. T. At first the C. G. T. joined the Red International of Labor Unions, but in the course of 1921, the syndicalists gained on the communists, canceled their affiliation with "Moscow," and made contacts with the syndicalists who were preparing to form their own International in Berlin. The C. G. T. led a number of violent strikes which were unsuc-

¹⁴ The Partido Laborista was organized in December 1919, as a "class party." Though organically separate from the C. R. O. M., it is in reality the political wing of organized labor and is guided by the *Grupo Acción* of the C. R. O. M.

cessful and which resulted in weakening its forces. The activities of the C. G. T. were chiefly important because they tended to strengthen the C. R. O. M. and to crystallize its outlook. The C. R. O. M. emerged from the turmoil of 1919-21 not only stronger economically and politically, but also definitely and bitterly opposed to the communists and syndicalists and more definitely committed to moderate methods and policies, similar to those of the A. F. of L.

3. Politics and Migration

Facing the unrest of 1919-1921, the A. F. of L. managed to steer the Pan-American Federation of Labor upon a moderate course. That was accomplished at the two congresses of the P. A. F. of L. held in July, 1919, in New York and in January, 1921, in Mexico City. At the New York congress, 24 delegates assembled from the A. F. of L., Mexico, Peru, Ecuador, Salvador, Nicaragua, and San Domingo. A great number of resolutions were passed upon a miscellaneous assortment of subjects including the eight-hour day, co-operative stores, education, immigration, a world federation of trade unions, the League of Nations, trade union organization, the need of special representation of wage earners at the Second Pan-American Financial Congress to be held in 1920. Of chief importance were the actions of the congress in regard to representation, political issues, and immigration.

Among the delegates to the congress there turned up a number of lawyers and other "intellectuals." The credentials committee recommended that in the future none but "men representative of workers," which was interpreted as "*bona fide* labor men," should be seated. Opposition developed from South American quarters where persons of independent means were still proving valuable in aiding labor to organize and to fight for liberty of association. Gompers, however, declared that the A. F. of L. would reserve the right not to be bound by decisions of future conventions if non-labor men were admitted, and the motion to seat none but *bona fide* labor men was unanimously carried.

A political question was raised when some delegates asked for co-operation of the Pan-American Federation of Labor in settling the difference between Chile and Peru over the Tacna-Arica territory, because national animosities were beginning to cause bad feeling between the workers of the two countries. The delegate from Ecuador objected, on the grounds that political subjects had been ruled out; otherwise he might present a list of grievances against Peru, but he held it was better not to import such matters into a labor conference. Gompers brushed these objections aside, declaring that the Pan-American Federation of Labor had originated in a political diplomatic crisis. Anything that promoted peace, he claimed, was the business of labor. The convention went on record favoring

prompt action by the officers on behalf of reaching a just solution.

The immigration issue was again raised by the Mexicans. They pointed out that the Atlantic City convention of the A. F. of L. in 1919 had approved restricted immigration, including immigration from Mexico, which was not in accord with the decisions of the Laredo conference. Gompers, making no attempt to reconcile the action at Atlantic City with the principles of Laredo, defended the A. F. of L. on the ground that American standards had to be protected against the hosts of immigrants who were supposed to be preparing to leave other countries for the United States.

4. Imperialism and Trade Unionism

At the congress in Mexico City, in January, 1921, there were 22 delegates from the United States, Mexico, Porto Rico, the Dominican Republic, Guatemala, Salvador, and Colombia. The congress was largely significant as a demonstration of the friendliness of the A. F. of L. for the new Obregon government. Receptions and banquets were arranged for the delegates by President Obregon, General Plutarco Calles, then minister of foreign affairs, and other members of the government. Gompers used the occasion to endorse President Obregon and his supporters as "men who have the best interests of the Mexican people at heart."

Despite the general atmosphere of cordiality, there was an undercurrent of feeling against the

A. F. of L. It was brought to the surface especially by two issues. One was the belief that the A. F. of L. had not sufficiently protested against President Wilson's policy in San Domingo and Nicaragua. Gompers reported upon visits which he had paid to the State Department to ascertain the action planned with regard to Porto Rico, Mexico, and Nicaragua. Gompers was, on the whole, satisfied with what he had learned at the State Department. The convention, however, protested against President Wilson's proclamation on San Domingo, and demanded immediate evacuation. A telegram transmitting this resolution was sent to President Wilson, much to the latter's displeasure.

The second issue concerned principles and policies of trade unionism. The Latin American delegates wanted more recognition for their brands of radical unionism, but their success was slight. The platform of principles which was adopted, while couched in spots in radical terms, emphasized only three definite ideas: the need of political freedom, the importance of collective bargaining, and the value of education to the workers of Pan-America. Thus the A. F. of L. did not swerve from its own conception of trade unionism as the only platform on which Pan-American labor could stand firmly together.

IV. GOMPERS' LAST PUBLIC ACT

During the four years from its third to its fourth congress, held in December, 1924, the Pan-American Federation of Labor made little, if any, headway

in extending its organization. Because of lack of funds, it failed to place organizers in the field, and owing to inadequate means of information, it was incapable of establishing proper connections with the labor movements of the South American Republics.

1. A "Labor Monroe Doctrine"

In fact, its chances of winning over South American labor became less favorable as a result of the rivalry of the other Internationals. "Amsterdam," the Syndicalist or Berlin International, the Red International of Labor Unions—all entered the race for the allegiance of the South American labor organizations. Already divided over questions of general doctrines, South American labor became split into more factions over the issues of international labor politics.

Even in Central America, the Pan-American Federation of Labor met with increasing difficulties during these years. Here its prestige was hurt because, following in the footsteps of the American government which frowned upon the plan of a Central American Republic, the A. F. of L. discouraged the idea of a Central American Federation of Labor, favored by the labor unions of Guatemala, Salvador, and Nicaragua. American policy in Nicaragua in 1922 and 1923, and the strained relations between the United States and Panama, contributed towards an anti-American feeling on the part of labor in these countries.

Against this background, the relations of the A. F. of L. and the C. R. O. M. stood out in their friendliness. The C. R. O. M., during these years, became the representative Mexican labor organization. Its membership increased from some 300,000 in 1920 to 1,200,000 in 1924; it embraced not only the important industrial labor elements of the country, but also the agricultural laborers; it was the main prop of the new Mexican state and the chief support of the Obregon government.

In its role as one of the chief builders of the new Mexican state, the C. R. O. M. continued to place great value on friendly relations with the A. F. of L. During 1923-24, its chief interest was to assure the good will of America for General Plutarco Calles as successor to President Obregon. In the fall of 1923, shortly after the Portland convention of the A. F. of L., representatives of the latter and of the C. R. O. M. met at El Paso, for "a thorough discussion of international labor relations, and of the political situation in Mexico." Gompers feared at the time that the Mexican labor leaders were planning to ally themselves with "Amsterdam." Morones, who had been to Europe during 1923, had invited some European trade union leaders to visit Mexico. John W. Brown, the English-speaking secretary of "Amsterdam," had thereupon written Gompers, informing him of his plan to lead a delegation to the United States and Mexico. To Gompers this looked like a European invasion of the American continent. The Mexican labor leaders

reassured him, however, that they would not affiliate with "Amsterdam," "Moscow" or any other movement, without first consulting the A. F. of L. Under Gompers' inspiration, the American and Mexican delegations announced what they termed "the Monroe Doctrine of Labor," jointly declaring their hostility to any efforts on the part of European labor to encroach upon "the sovereignty" of labor in the Western hemisphere.

2. The American-Mexican Labor Alliance

In return for this, Gompers and the officers of the Pan-American Federation of Labor declared their sympathy with the Obregon government which was engaged in quelling the revolt of Adolpho De la Huerta. Gompers wrote Secretary Hughes asking that the law against transporting arms into Mexico be strictly enforced. Gompers also officially requested American trade unions engaged in transport work at border ports to assist in the detection of gun-running. In consequence, American organized labor played an important part in the crushing of the De la Huerta revolt and in the victory of Obregon. All along the Mexican border and the Mexican Gulf, and in a number of seaports both on the Atlantic and the Pacific coasts, American trade unionists, especially members of the International Association of Machinists and of the Seamen's Union of North America, were active in blocking the activities of sympathizers and agents of De la Huerta and in

preventing the shipment of arms to them. The Executive Committee of the A. F. of L. cabled to "Amsterdam" for support in stopping the transport of arms from Europe.

The success of the co-operative efforts of the C. R. O. M. and of the A. F. of L. was the main feature of the fourth congress of the Pan-American Federation of Labor, which met in Mexico City, December 3-9, 1924. It followed immediately upon the convention of the A. F. of L. at El Paso, Texas, and upon the convention of the C. R. O. M. at Juarez, across the bridge from El Paso. On November 30, a delegation from the A. F. of L. attended the inauguration of President Calles which was made the occasion for "fraternal celebrations."

In this and in other ways, the congress demonstrated that, if unsuccessful in his larger plans, Gompers had succeeded in cementing an American-Mexican labor alliance which had become an important factor in Mexican-American relations. The affirmation of this alliance at the congress of the P. A. F. L. in Mexico City was Gompers' last public act.

PART IV

STABILIZATION AND REORGANIZATION, 1924-1928

CHAPTER XIII

MOODS OF TRANSITION, 1924-1926

After five years of turmoil, the year 1924 brought signs of a definite turn towards industrial recovery and social stability. A fresh attack on the reparations problem¹ resulted in the adoption of the Dawes Plan; the German mark was stabilized; international loans for German payments to the Allies and for the reconstruction of German finance and industry were floated. With the outstanding exception of England, other countries of Europe gave evidence of trade improvement. In international politics, peaceful tendencies came to the fore, as was shown by the formulation of the "Protocol of Peace" and by the *de jure* recognition of Soviet Russia by Great Britain, Austria, Sweden, Germany, Hungary, France, Japan, and China.

Though developments since 1924 have not been smooth or uniform, the general tendency has been on the side of economic improvement and political pacification. World production in industry and agriculture and world trade have steadily increased, industrial technique and organization have been

¹ This was facilitated by the political changes of the year. Ramsay MacDonald became prime minister of England on January 22, 1924; Edouard Herriot succeeded Poincaré as premier of France on June 14, 1924.

overhauled and "rationalized,"² new industries and new industrial areas have been developed, finances have been stabilized, international economic relations have been improved, while better political understanding among the Great Powers has been fostered by the Locarno Pact, by Germany's admission to the League of Nations, by the Kellogg Pact, and in other ways.

These economic and political changes have stimulated a change also in outlook. There has been a growing feeling that the upheaval from 1919 to 1923 was an aftermath of the war which is definitely over, and that a new era has set in which holds the promise of great scientific inventions, of unfolding productive energies, of greater opportunities for exploiting the resources of the world, and of new controls over industrial and social organization. In general, the financial, employing, managing, and professional groups in the leading countries of the world have regained assurance of their capacity for a lasting leadership. This feeling has been enhanced by the growing influence of the United States in world affairs.

In the world of labor, the trend of the last five years towards a new economic and social equilibrium

² The term "rationalization" has come into use during the last few years in Europe to designate the reorganization of industry upon more "rational" and efficient lines by means of improved machinery, automatic processes, greater standardization, large-scale production, more effective systems of plant management, and various forms of industrial combinations.

has been summed up in the word "stabilization." Most of the thinking and planning in the international labor movement has been concerned with the nature and scope of this "stabilization," its duration, its possible effects, and ways of meeting the problems which it creates. Though affecting labor in different countries unevenly, stabilization has in all countries brought the organizations of labor up against new conditions, causing a crisis in their internal life and forcing upon them basic problems of readjustment and reorganization.

For these reasons, the five years since 1924 in the international labor movement may be described as a period of "stabilization and reorganization." In the general story of this period, the years 1924-1926 form a transition. These years were marked by uncertain moods and great struggles which revealed the shift in the relative strength of the labor movements of the separate countries. Upon this, followed in 1926-27 the internal crises which signified the inner readjustment to these changes. Though none of the international labor organizations fully outlived their crises in 1928, they took long steps during the year towards the levels of thought and conduct upon which they are likely to remain for some time to come.

I. NEW BRITISH ORIENTATIONS

How unevenly the swing of 1924 affected labor was shown at the meetings which the several Inter-

nationals held in rapid succession in the summer of 1924. At the third regular congress of the I. F. T. U. which opened in Vienna on June 2, 1924, British labor came forth as a "Left wing" in opposition to the majority of the delegates. As the British Trade Union Congress was the most powerful member of the I. F. T. U., the German unions not having recovered from the wreckage of 1923 and the A. F. of L. not being affiliated, the emergence of such a "Left" wing meant a new struggle for the orientation of "Amsterdam."

While the British and the Continental delegates disagreed in many essentials as to the economic and political outlook, that did not affect the general program of the I. F. T. U. The clash came on the "Russian question." Fred Bramley, one of the leaders of the British delegation,³ attacked the Management Committee of the I. F. T. U. for discontinuing negotiations with the Russians.⁴ After heated debates, the congress passed a resolution regretting the continued absence of the Russian trade unions and directing the Amsterdam Bureau "to continue consultations," in so far as that was compatible with the dignity of the I. F. T. U., with the object of securing the inclusion of Russia in the international trade union movement, through the necessary acceptance of the rules and conditions of the I. F. T. U.

³ Died in 1925.

⁴ See Chapter X, pp. 245-246.

Another problem in which the "Russian question" was involved was that of the relations between the I. F. T. U. and the International Trade Secretariats. During the year preceding the Vienna congress, the International Federation of Metal Workers and the International Transport Workers' Federation had negotiated with the Russian trade unions, while the International Federation of Food and Drink Workers had admitted the Russian Food Workers' Union to membership. Such action carried the germs of internal disruption, and "Amsterdam" demanded that the Trade Secretariats accept only unions belonging to the centers affiliated with it. But the Secretariats refused to do more than regard this as a guiding principle and to discuss exceptions with "Amsterdam," reserving final judgment to themselves. The Vienna congress endorsed this agreement, but in order to cement relations with the Secretariats, the congress gave the Trade Secretariats three places upon the Amsterdam Management Committee, besides allowing all Trade Secretariats to attend the congresses of the I. F. T. U. in a consultative capacity.

British influence was clearly acknowledged in the elections. A. A. Purcell was elected president of the I. F. T. U. to take the place of J. H. Thomas, who resigned. J. W. Brown became English-speaking secretary, thus making the total number of secretaries three, the other two being Oudegeest of Holland and Johann Sassenbach of Germany.

Purcell and Brown, as well as Bromley and George Hicks, the British members on the General Council of the I. F. T. U., were all regarded as "Left wingers."

II. COMMUNIST PREPAREDNESS AND BOLSHEVIZATION

Even more than the Vienna congress of the I. F. T. U., the fifth congress of the Third International which met in Moscow from June 17 to July 8, 1924, was marked by conflicting attitudes. While admitting that there were signs of increasing economic and political stability, the communist leaders declared these signs to be illusory. Capitalist economy, they still insisted, was in a condition of "permanent crisis," as shown by the extent of unemployment and by continuing antagonisms of nations and classes, and even American prosperity, they prophesied, would soon give way to a "period of crises." Politically, capitalism was also said to be hopelessly undermined, having recourse for the purposes of government either to Fascism or to Social Democracy.

According to this analysis, the immediate future still held "violent struggles" in store. Signs of a coming clash were the antagonisms between American and Japanese "imperialisms" in the Orient; the nationalist rumblings in Northern Africa, Syria, India, and China; the industrial difficulties in England. The Dawes Plan was likely to make for friction because it was another way of con-

tinuing the war and of enslaving the workers of Germany.

But if "great struggles" were ahead, the communists were no longer certain whether these struggles would end in the "downfall of capitalism" or in its "stabilization." Capitalism, like other "class regimes," could not fall "automatically, without a decisive and vigorous attack of the revolutionary proletariat." It was up to the communists to get ready for the "revolutionary situation" which was to be expected in the near future.

Looking over the situation, the fifth congress of the Third International felt that the communist parties in most countries were not prepared for an emergency. In Germany, after the "October retreat" of 1923, the Executive Committee of the Third International had deposed the "Right wing" leaders, Brandler and Thalheimer, and had installed new leaders, Ruth Fischer, Maslov, Scholem, Rosenberg, and Karl Korsch. But these leaders had swung too far to the "Left," urging the members of the German Communist Party to abandon the trade unions, staging guerilla battles, opposing the policy of the "United Front," and defying the Executive Committee of the Third International.

In France, there were troubles of another kind. During the general elections of May, 1924, the "Right wing" of the French communists overstepped the limits of the "United Front" and made deals with socialists and other parties. The Executive

Committee of the Third International had to intervene to "purify" the French party from such "Right" and "opportunist" elements. But this interference was resented by many and caused internal division.⁵

Similar conditions were to be recorded in other countries. "Right wings" were in control of the communist parties in Poland, Sweden, Czechoslovakia, Bulgaria; in Italy, Bordiga was persisting in his "Left deviation." A new controversy had also arisen in the Communist Party of Russia since the death of Lenin,⁶ an insurgency being led by Trotsky.

After a long battle which consumed most of the sessions and during which charges and counter-charges were exchanged freely, the congress endorsed the Executive Committee. All "deviations" to "the Right" or to "the Left" were condemned. A program explaining the trend of events and laying down the foundations of communist policy was approved by reference to Marx and Lenin. For the first time, Lenin's name was coupled in this way with that of Marx, and communism was placed on the theoretical pillars of a composite doctrine designated as "Marxism-Leninism."

⁵ Boris Souvarine, since 1919 the chief spokesman of the Third International in France and known as the "eye of Moscow" in Paris, began attacking the Third International for its policy towards the French communists, in a periodical "Le Bulletin Communiste" which he filled with what may be called the "scandals of communism."

⁶ Lenin died in January, 1924.

Of the decisions of the congress, the most important were those which dealt with the "United Front" and "Bolshevization." The "United Front" was again approved as an essential communist method. The new slogan, "Bolshevization," was interpreted to mean that the communist parties in the different countries were to incorporate in their programs and in their tactics those elements of Russian Bolshevism which were internationally applicable. First of all, to become "Bolshevized," every communist party had to reorganize itself on the basis of "factory cells," instead of residential districts. The statutes of the Third International, as a whole, were revised so as to make it a more highly centralized world party, a "monolith hewn out of a single block."

Following the fifth congress of the Third International, the R. I. L. U. held its third congress, also in Moscow, and launched the slogan for a new phase of the "United Front" in the trade union world—"International Unity." A "world unity congress" at which the R. I. L. U. and "Amsterdam" would be proportionally represented was to be called to form a new unified Trade Union International.

III. THE ANGLO-RUSSIAN COMMITTEE

The decisions of the three congresses started new moves for trade union unity. In July, 1924, the Executive Committee of the I. F. T. U. invited the All-Russian Council of Trade Unions to affiliate.

The Russians replied, asking for a conference between the I. F. T. U. and the R. I. L. U., "on the basis of equality and mutual attention." The I. F. T. U. Executive retorted that it would be desirable "to have something in writing as a basis of discussion." Tomsky replied that the Russians were willing to co-operate in a Trade Union International whose guiding principles were "class war to the knife . . . and a complete break with every form of class collaboration." He asked for a preliminary meeting between the I. F. T. U. and the All-Russian Council of Trade Unions to talk matters over. Oudegeest, for the I. F. T. U., then veered around and, in a letter dated December 5, 1924, disclaimed competency for the Executive Committee of the I. F. T. U. to pass on this proposal, saying that it would be considered at the next meeting of the General Council of the I. F. T. U.

When this meeting was called, on February 5, 1925, it revealed the same division of opinion as at the Vienna congress. The British delegates were for an unconditional conference between the All-Russian Council of Trade Unions and the I. F. T. U.⁷ but this was rejected by 13 votes against six. Instead, a resolution was adopted to the effect that the I. F. T. U. was "prepared to admit the All-

⁷ In November, 1924, a British Trade Union Delegation had visited Russia. A. A. Purcell, chairman of the delegation, while in Moscow, declared that, if "Amsterdam" could not, the British would establish trade union unity. The delegation made a favorable report on Russian conditions.

Russian Council of Trade Unions," whenever the latter expressed its desire to be admitted, and that the I. F. T. U. would convene a conference with the All-Russian Council of Trade Unions only *after* the latter had "intimated" its desire for affiliation with the I. F. T. U.

In reply to this decision, the leaders of the British Trade Union Congress met with delegates of the All-Russian Council of Trade Unions in London on April 6 and 7, 1925, and signed an agreement of co-operation. A Joint Anglo-Russian Advisory Committee, known as the Anglo-Russian Committee, or A. R. A. C.—consisting of the chairmen, secretaries, and members of the executives of the Russian and British trade unions—was formed to put the agreement into effect. According to this agreement, the Russians were to notify "Amsterdam" that they were willing to participate in a Trade Union International not essentially different from "Amsterdam." On their part, the British were to try to induce "Amsterdam" to call an unconditional conference with the Russian trade unions, and if "Amsterdam" persisted in its refusal, the British themselves were to convene a general trade union conference "to promote international unity."

IV. ZIGZAGS AND OSCILLATIONS

From the end of 1924 to the spring of 1926, the international labor organizations were agitated by the conflicting trends of the rapidly chang-

ing international situation. At the end of 1924, there were a number of labor and socialist reverses, the most spectacular of which was the fall of the MacDonald government in England and the return to power of the Conservative Party by a large majority. All through 1925, world economic conditions showed continued improvement, but there were important exceptions that made for uncertainty. In Germany, industry, stimulated at first by foreign credits, fell into a depression towards the end of the year, resulting in serious unemployment. In England, output in the basic industries fell and unemployment reached its highest level in three years. In France and Belgium, financial inflation was becoming critical. In politics, labor and liberal governments gave way to conservative governments in England, Germany, Sweden, and other countries, seemingly coinciding with another flare-up of national antagonisms.⁸ But while these political changes resulted in the shelving of the Protocol of Peace, they did not prevent the signing of the "Locarno Pact" and of its annexes, which provided for the arbitration of disputes through the League of Nations between Germany, France, Belgium, Czechoslovakia, and Poland.

In the world of labor, too, developments were conflicting. All through 1925, industries in many

⁸ The election of Hindenburg as president of Germany on April 26, 1925, was received by the rest of the world as evidence of such a tendency in Germany.

parts of the world were involved in big strikes and lockouts. While many of these were in defense against continued wage cuts and "inflation" or "deflation" policies, some had an offensive character. Those which attracted international interest were the general lockouts over wages in Sweden and Denmark in March; the threatened coal strike in England in July which was postponed by the government's vote of a £10,000,000 subsidy and the appointment of a Royal Commission to investigate the industry; the "unofficial" strike of seamen at London and Southampton against wage cuts which had been agreed to by the leaders of the British Seamen's Union; and several strikes in the textile industries of Germany and Austria. Complicated in its effects was also the wave of nationalist and industrial unrest which swept over the colonial countries and the Orient, from Morocco through Egypt and Syria to India and China. Politically, and especially industrially, the sudden emergence of an Oriental labor movement, as exemplified by the strikes of the cotton mill operatives in Shanghai in February and June, 1925, and of the 135,000 textile workers of Bombay later in the year, raised new problems for Western labor.

In interpreting and meeting these developments, "Amsterdam" and the Socialist International and "Moscow" followed divergent lines. On the whole, "Amsterdam" and the socialists tried to promote the tendencies towards peace and stability, though

remaining critical towards the policies which they were helping to carry through. When the Dawes Plan was put into effect, "Amsterdam" and the socialists accepted it as "the only possible solution," while criticizing what they regarded as its defects.⁹ When the Locarno Pact was signed by Chamberlain, Briand, and Stresemann, in October, 1925, "Amsterdam" and the Socialist International, though favoring the Geneva Protocol, now greeted "Locarno" as the "first step towards the pacification of Europe."

With regard to the nationalist movements in Africa and Asia, "Amsterdam" and the socialists took a friendly, though passive attitude. The second congress of the Labor and Socialist International, held at Marseilles in August, 1925, "hailed the awakening of the great working masses of the Chinese, Indian, and Mohammedan world," demanded the abolition of external controls and extra-territorial rights in China and the immediate introduction of modern industrial legislation for the Chinese workers. It criticized the behavior of the French Socialist Party in the Riffian and Syrian wars.¹⁰

⁹ In the joint statement which the I. F. T. U. and the Labor and Socialist International issued on the Dawes Plan they criticized its failure to cancel inter-allied debts, and to forego all claims to the recovery of military pensions from Germany; the disproportionate burden which it placed upon the working class; the subjection of the state railway system to foreign influence. They also demanded the evacuation of the Ruhr both in a military and in an economic sense.

¹⁰ The French Socialist Party, after its debacle in 1921-22, began to revive, received a large vote in the elections of 1924, and became the second largest party in the Chamber of Deputies. It

"Amsterdam" took a similar attitude and sent a telegram of encouragement to the workers of China. But it showed a more practical interest in the lock-outs in Scandinavia, organizing a collection of nearly a million dollars, which helped the Danish workers to win their demands and the Swedish trade unions to make a compromise settlement. To the textile strikers of Bombay, "Amsterdam" sent about \$13,000.

On the other hand, the Third International and the R. I. L. U. steered a zigzag course. In March and April, 1925, the Enlarged Executive Committee of the Third International admitted that largely owing to the Dawes Plan, the "bourgeois world" had become for the time stabilized, though important oscillations were still occurring. Zinoviev and the other leaders were willing to admit that the communists had expected "the revolution" to occur too quickly and had probably made mistakes as to its "route." Just the same, they rejected the Dawes Plan in toto and called upon their followers to obstruct its operations.

During the summer and fall of 1925 developments in Europe were not such as to give the Third International much comfort. Communist organizations formed an alliance with the Radical Party of Painlevé and Herriot and was thus an active partner in the government; in fact was said by its opponents to be the "tail wagging the dog." Its conduct was therefore affected by the contradictory motives of allegiance to the government and of opposition to war. In June, 1925, it voted for Painlevé and for the credits for the campaign in Morocco.

were losing in membership over a wide area, and were being destroyed or driven underground in Spain, Italy, the Balkans, and the Baltic countries. In Germany, the Third International was at loggerheads with the leaders of the German party over the latter's behavior during the presidential elections of April, 1925. In defiance of all "United Front" slogans, the German Communist party had refused to support the former Chancellor, Wilhelm Marx, who was the coalition candidate of the socialists and of the republican parties, and had put up a candidate of its own, Thälmann, thus splitting the vote and assuring the election of Hindenburg. When the German communists were censured for this by the Executive Committee of the Third International, the Maslov-Fischer adherents rebelled, denouncing the "opportunism" and "bureaucracy" of the Russian leaders of the Third International, and raising the issue whether the Russian Communist Party was any longer entitled to hold leadership in the Third International. In France, on the other hand, the communists, in line with the policies of the Third International, had tried to obstruct the French military campaign in Morocco through a boycott on munitions, mutinies in the army, and a 24-hour general strike, but had been unsuccessful, and had aroused much opposition against their tactics not only in the general labor movement, but in their own ranks.

In Russia, too, not all was well with the Com-

munist Party. A "new opposition," under the leadership of Zinoviev and Kamenev, was now raising its head, attacking the conciliatory attitude of Stalin, Rykov, and Bukharin towards the Russian peasantry. For the first time in the history of the Russian party, the "new opposition" carried the fight into the open, trying to organize a center for itself in Leningrad.

But in contrast to events in Europe, the Third International was buoyed up by what was happening in Africa and Asia. With the rising tide in Morocco, Egypt, Syria, India, and China, in the course of 1925, the leaders of the Third International began to consider the possibility that the zig-zag course of history was "routing the Revolution" towards the Orient. Communists were urged to pursue an aggressive "anti-imperialist" policy, and the Third International launched a movement to concentrate all elements friendly to the Chinese nationalists around the slogan of "Hands off China!" In England, the communists and the more radical socialists, not content with the milder protests of the Labor Party, arranged demonstrations against the Baldwin government and against the dispatch of troops to Shanghai, without appreciable results. The R. I. L. U. turned its attention to the rising labor movement of China and sent \$15,000 to the strikers of Shanghai.

This dualism in the outlook of the Third International was clearly shown at the meeting of the

Enlarged Executive Committee of the Third International, in February and March, 1926, at which some 100 delegates from 42 countries were present. Capitalism at this meeting was still described as "stabilized," but as less so than in 1925, the tendency now being characterized not only as "relative and partial," but as an "unstable stabilization." Nevertheless, the Enlarged Communist Executive felt that the general situation was too incalculable to predict either the course or the tempo of "revolutionary developments." The communists were again advised to devote themselves to "winning the masses."

V. UNITY, UNITY, THERE IS NO UNITY!

Regardless of the divergent policies of "Amsterdam" and the R. I. L. U., of the Socialists and the communists, agitation continued all through 1925 and early in 1926 for their unification. The driving force in this campaign were the British trade unionists and socialists who saw in the Russian market a chance for the revival of British industry and who were worried by economic depression and by the specter of big strikes ahead.

Under British pressure, both "Moscow" and "Amsterdam" resumed negotiations, where the decision of February, 1925, had left off.¹¹ On May 19, Tomskey wrote a letter to "Amsterdam," worded so as formally to fulfil the agreement of the Anglo-Russian Committee and yet to maintain the original

¹¹ See pp. 314-315.

Russian demands. At the same time, the British called for a reconsideration of "Amsterdam's" decision of February, 1925. The statements of the British trade unionists and the activities of the Anglo-Russian Committee created an impression that the British were not averse to breaking up "Amsterdam" in order to organize a new trade union International.

In view of this, the Continental leaders of "Amsterdam" went to London on December 1, 1925, to sound out the British trade union leaders. The British explained that they had no intention of accepting communist principles in any form, but that they thought it essential to close up the split in the trade unions of the different countries and that for this purpose they were willing to give the Russians as much consideration as possible. The British denied any intention to break away from "Amsterdam."

Thus reassured, the Amsterdam General Council, on December 4, 1925, reaffirmed its decision of February, 1925, against the votes of the British members. The British asked for a reconsideration of the subject in February, 1926, but their request was declined by the Executive Committee of "Amsterdam." The Continental leaders of "Amsterdam" argued that the British were being duped by the Russians whose scheme was to gain admission to the I. F. T. U. in order to disrupt it from within.

Concurrently with the negotiations for trade union unity, the British Independent Labor Party

undertook to bring the Socialist and the Third International together for the purpose of "exploring the possibilities of the formation of an all-inclusive International." In the opinion of the British Independents, unity was needed for common action "against Capitalist and Imperialist reaction and the menace of Fascism in Europe," and was now made possible because the communists were moderating their tactics.

But as soon as the proposal was made public, Zinoviev declared, in Moscow early in March, 1926, that the communist answer was "No! A thousand times no!" In Zinoviev's words, the Third International wanted "unity among the working class, but unity based on communism, on Leninism." Regardless of this, A. Fenner-Brockway, secretary of the Independent Labor Party, submitted the British proposal to the executive committee of the Socialist International at its session in Zurich on April 13, 1926. It was opposed by the British Labor Party, and was rejected by a vote of 247 against 3. As in 1922, so now in 1926, socialists and communists were no more ready to unite than were "Amsterdam" and the R. I. L. U.

VI. THE BRITISH STRIKES OF 1926

In the early spring of 1926 the eyes of European labor became fixed on England, where a conflict in the mining industry now seemed certain. In view of the commitments of the British trade unions to

the miners, it was clear that a miners' strike would have not only nation-wide, but international reverberations. Because of this, the executive committee of the International Miners' Federation met in Brussels on April 18, and declared themselves ready to aid the British miners in case of a strike. Two main methods were considered, the prevention of coal imports into England and an international strike. The former method was endorsed, the latter was left to the decision of the miners in the different countries.

On April 30, a day after the General Council of the British Trade Union Congress decided to support the miners by a general strike, the Amsterdam Bureau received a letter from the Council inquiring as to the assistance which "Amsterdam" could render. Prompted by this letter, the Amsterdam Bureau, on May 3, wired its affiliated centers to take steps at once to aid the British unions on request. Telegrams were also sent by the Bureau to the trade unions of the United States, Mexico, New Zealand, Australia, South Africa, India, Dutch East Indies, and Japan, appealing for co-operation, in case of need. On May 4, 1926, the day the general strike went into effect in England, the Amsterdam Bureau wired its affiliated unions that the British trade unions were "particularly anxious about the export of coal and about the prevention of the bunkering of coal on British ships," and asked its affiliated centers to "consider immediately what could be

done" and to telegraph funds. In the meanwhile, on May 3, the International Transport Workers' Federation, in response to telegrams from England and from the International Miners' Federation, had already wired to its affiliated unions in France, Belgium, Germany, Holland, and the Scandinavian countries, to stop all exports of coal to Great Britain, to prevent the bunkering of coal on and the recruiting of crews for British ships. The telegrams were supplemented by letters and circulars explaining the British general strike, the importance of international labor action on its behalf, and elaborating the measures to be taken.

The response to these instructions and requests was unexampled in the history of the international labor movement. For a week after the general strike began, telegrams poured in to the British Trade Union Council, expressing solidarity, transmitting funds, and announcing the steps taken to support the strike. Besides giving varying amounts from their general funds, the trade unions of many countries organized collections in the unions, in shops, and in the streets, and imposed special "solidarity assessments" on their members.¹² Railwaymen, dockers, and other transport workers took steps

¹² In Holland, 25-cent "stamps of solidarity" were put on sale; the Danish trade unions offered to make weekly payments for the duration of the strike; the Swiss trade unions called upon their members to levy themselves not less than one franc per head; in France, the printers of Paris, who had just obtained a wage increase, handed over the amount of the increase to the British strikers. In Germany, big mass meetings were held at which collections were taken up.

to stop exports of coal to England and the bunkering of British ships. The Danish and Dutch transport workers began the embargo without waiting for instructions. The Swedish, Norwegian, and Finnish trade unions threw in their support as soon as they were called upon. In France, a "vigilance committee" was organized by miners, railwaymen, dockers, and seamen, to enforce the embargo. In Germany, the transport workers' union refused to handle coal or strike-breakers for England. The Polish unions at Danzig forbade all coal exports. In Czechoslovakia, the miners' and railwaymen's unions organized "Trade Union Control Commissions" which were placed at the frontiers to stop any increased coal exports from the country. Measures intended for the same purpose, though less radical in character, were taken by the trade unions of Canada, Mexico, Australia, and India. To co-ordinate these activities, the International Federation of Trade Unions published information on the situation in England, while the secretary of the International Transport Workers' Federation, Edo Fimmen, issued special bulletins daily in German, French, English, Dutch, and Swedish, dispatched letters and telegrams to affiliated trade unions, and kept in daily contact with London over the long distance telephone. The measures taken on behalf of the British strikers were broadcast through the broadcasting station of the Dutch Workers' Radio Society.

On the fifth day of the British general strike, on

May 8, representatives of the International Miners' Federation, of the International Transport Workers' Federation, and of the International Federation of Trade Unions met at Ostend to consider means of extending the embargo. The British trade unions were asking that the embargo be extended to all merchandise destined for England, and also that a complete embargo should be placed upon the discharge of all British ships in Continental ports. Both measures involved great difficulties; the latter especially threatened in some countries to stop the national industries from receiving necessary raw materials. In view of this, it was decided to request the trade unions of the various countries only to extend the embargo on all merchandise going to England, "if possible." The task was assigned to the secretariat of the International Transport Workers' Federation, upon which fell the brunt of the effort to effect a general European, if not a world, embargo by organized labor against Great Britain.

During these days, the rivals and opponents of "Amsterdam" also came forward with offers of aid. The International Federation of Christian Trade Unions and the International Christian Miners' Secretariat endorsed the strike of the British miners and extended a helping hand which was, however, ignored. In the Ruhr, Christian trade unions joined with those affiliated to "Amsterdam" to enforce the decision of the International Miners' Federation that no coal be allowed to go to England. The

R. I. L. U. instructed its followers to assist in carrying out the embargo and suggested that all workers levy themselves a quarter of a day's pay for the benefit of the British workers. The executive committee of the Third International issued similar appeals and the Workers' International Relief, an organization under communist influence, organized collections in Germany, France, and other countries.

Most spectacular was the response of the trade unions of Russia. "The British workers," declared the chairman of the Leningrad Trade Union Council, "prevented in 1920 the intervention of the British bourgeoisie against Soviet Russia. We will pay back our debt a hundredfold." Street demonstrations were held all over Russia to show the solidarity of the Russian workers with those of England and to hail the great steps of the British workers towards their "emancipation." Theatres gave benefit performances, newspapers opened special funds. All British ships in Russian ports were held up by the Russian transport workers and dockers. All Soviet ships on the way to Britain were instructed by wireless to join the strike on entering a British port. The All-Russian Council of Trade Unions ordered a levy of a quarter day's pay on all the workers of Russia. When some £350,000 (about \$1,600,000) were collected, a first instalment of £26,427 (about \$128,000) was transmitted by wire to the British Trade Union Congress, but was refused by the lat-

ter. Later instalments were ordered returned to Moscow by the Secretary for Home Affairs, Sir W. Joynson-Hicks.

These activities on behalf of the British workers were having effect, but only a partial effect. Exports of coal to England were seriously interfered with, and the bunkering of British ships in most European ports was reduced to a minimum. But the extension of the embargo to all merchandise going to England was not making much progress. Besides, with every day of the general strike the difficulties of these international labor activities became greater. The British trade union leaders, absorbed in the problems created by their strike at home, and totally unprepared for the situation, failed to keep "Amsterdam" informed as to what was going on. Deprived of first-hand information, the Amsterdam Bureau hesitated to proceed with further plans. The lack of information from England, as well as from the countries whose sympathetic action was essential, hampered also the activities of the International Transport Workers' Secretariat. The fact that no preparations had been made in advance for international action, obstructed the plan for extending such action. Many trade unions on the Continent, for instance, were unwilling to do anything which could be interpreted as a violation of their collective agreements with their employers. In addition to this, there was friction not only between communist and non-communist labor organizations, but

between the various "Amsterdam" organizations themselves. The International Miners' Federation did not co-operate sufficiently with the others, while Fimmen and Oudegeest could not agree on essential points. Fimmen demanded that part of the funds which were being collected by "Amsterdam" should be used to help the transport workers who were likely to be "victimized" for carrying out the embargo; this Oudegeest refused to do, on the ground that all funds were being raised for the British strikers and could not be diverted to other purposes.

On May 10 and 11, a special meeting of the executive committee of the I. F. T. U. was called to consider the question of further support for the British strike, and on May 12, a joint meeting for the same purpose was held by the executive committees of "Amsterdam" and of the Socialist International. To the disappointment of these committees, none of the British members arrived to report on the situation. The executive committee of the Socialist International decided that the British strike was purely industrial in character and that whatever international support it needed should be given by "Amsterdam." On the other hand, the Amsterdam Executive, lacking information, decided to send Oudegeest and Brown to London to ascertain the facts. At the same time, the International Transport Workers' Secretariat was holding a meeting in Duisburg with Dutch and German transport

workers to consider further measures for tightening the embargo at the port of Rotterdam, where union organization was weak, and for preventing coal from the Ruhr from reaching England.

While these meetings were in session, word was received that the British General Strike had been called off. At once the international labor situation changed. The International Federation of Trade Unions could no longer, under its rules and regulations, continue international relief collections,¹³ and was ready to step out. The International Transport Workers' Secretariat not only had to drop at once its plans for extending the general embargo on all merchandise to England, but it found itself in an embarrassing position with regard to the embargo on coal. As the miners' strike in England was to go on, C. T. Cramp, of the British Railwaymen, and E. Bevin, of the British Transport Workers, requested the Transport Workers' Secretariat to continue the embargo on coal to England. At the same time, however, the railwaymen, transport workers, dockers, and seamen of Great Britain were resuming work and were handling all goods, including British and foreign coal. In the face of such procedure, the Continental transport workers could not be expected to carry on an embargo, and Edo

¹³ The rules of the I. F. T. U. provide that in case of a large strike in one industry, relief is to be under the supervision of the corresponding trade secretariat; the British miners thus had to make their appeals through the International Miners' Federation.

Fimmen wired all affiliated unions of the International Transport Workers' Federation, rescinding previous instructions and authorizing the handling of all British vessels in Continental ports.

With the collapse of the embargo, it also became clear that an international strike of miners was out of the question. In the first place, the British themselves were divided as to the advisability of such action. While A. J. Cook, the secretary of the British Miners' Federation, urged it, Frank Hodges, secretary of the International Miners' Federation, opposed it strenuously and advised the British miners to accept a longer working day and end the strike. Secondly, the miners of Germany, Czechoslovakia, Belgium, and Poland were drawing benefit from the British strike, having for the first time in many months steady employment and an opportunity for increased earnings,¹⁴ and could not be expected to make the sacrifice. In view of these facts the executive committee of the International Miners' Federation which met several times, between May and October, 1926, to consider the situation, confined itself to the passing of ambiguous resolutions promising to consider international strike action, and kept putting off such action, until the British miners' strike was over.¹⁵

¹⁴ In July, 1926, the miners of the Ruhr were granted an increase in wage rates by the Court of Industrial Arbitration.

¹⁵ The miners' strike began to disintegrate in October, 1926, and came to an end in November.

VII. THE PRICE OF FAILURE

International action on behalf of the British workers was thus reduced to financial aid. A few days after the general strike had been called off, A. A. Purcell arrived in Amsterdam, and asked the Amsterdam Bureau to extend to him facilities in collecting contributions for the British Trade Union Congress, in order to assist it in meeting the "responsibilities arising from the general strike." The largest and strongest trade unions in England had depleted their funds during the general strike, and the General Council of the Trade Union Congress was in financial straits. After some discussion Purcell decided that the best method for meeting the situation was to raise an "international labor loan" for the British Trade Union Congress. This plan was approved at a special conference of "Amsterdam" organizations on May 31, 1926, and though there was some friction as to the form of the loan, the rate of interest, and the provisions for repayment, an agreement was finally reached in July, 1926, resulting afterwards in a loan of about \$380,000 for the British Trade Union Congress.

The collections for the British miners, during the six and a half months of their strike, totaled \$9,375,000. Of this total some \$3,000,000 were contributed by the people of England, while \$5,750,000 were given by the Russian trade unions. The trade

unions of all other countries sent in about \$650,000.¹⁶ The contributions of the "Amsterdam" organizations were smaller than might have been expected. There were three main reasons for this. One was the internal friction between the British Miners' Federation, led by A. J. Cook, and the British General Council. It was not until August, 1926, that the latter submitted a request to the Amsterdam Bureau to solicit funds for the miners, and sent special commissions—one to the Continent and another to the United States—to make an appeal for aid. A second reason were the internal divisions within the international labor movement. Cook's close association with the communists and with the Russians antagonized non-communist labor; the widespread disappointment in the manner in which the British General Strike was suddenly ended and the feeling that the British workers had never shown much readiness to help workers of other countries, prevented the unloosing of purse strings. A third reason was the weakened financial condition in most countries of the trade unions affiliated with "Amsterdam."

While the Russians gave aid with one hand, they struck out with the other. As soon as the general

¹⁶ Account given by A. J. Cook at the Seventh Congress of the Russian Trade Unions. See *La Vie Ouvrière*, January 14, 1927. The total relief given to the miners of Great Britain by the Poor Law authorities, by private collections, and by trade unions cannot be accurately calculated. For details of collections, see Chapter XVI, p. 399 and Appendix.

strike was called off, the executive committee of the Third International began issuing "statements" and "appeals" in which the British trade union leaders were accused of having "betrayed" the British workers. The executive committee of the R. I. L. U. followed suit, denouncing the "treacherous behavior" of the Amsterdam International, and attacking the International Miners' Federation for its alleged "sabotage" of the British miners. In the same spirit, the All-Russian Council of Trade Unions poured invective not only upon the "Right" leaders of British labor, J. H. Thomas, Walter Citrine, Ramsay MacDonald, but also on the "Left wingers" Purcell, Hicks, Swales, for having "surrendered" to the "Right" during the General Strike.

Regardless of these denunciations, the Russian trade union leaders called for a meeting of the Anglo-Russian Committee to discuss ways and means of helping the striking miners. After an exchange of correspondence, the British acceded to the request, and a meeting was held in Paris on July 30 and 31. The British delegates to this meeting demanded first of all that the All-Russian Council of Trade Unions withdraw its attacks on the British Council, vigorously declaring that the British Council "would not grant any one the right to interfere in the internal affairs of the British trade union movement." The Paris meeting adjourned without coming to any decision.

Though the Russian trade union leaders persisted

in their criticisms,¹⁷ the British agreed to meet them again, and on August 23-24 and 25, 1926, the Anglo-Russian Committee convened in Berlin. After a day's wrangling, the British agreed to discuss the question of international aid for the miners. The Russians then put forth a series of proposals which included an embargo on coal, a condemnation of "Amsterdam," and a number of political measures. All these were rejected by the British as either beyond the scope of the committee or as having already been tried and likely to be more harmful than useful under the circumstances. As neither side was willing to make concessions, no agreement was reached on the subject. A compromise, however, was arrived at on "international unity." The British again promised to call, "upon their own initiative and under their observation," a preliminary conference, "without any restrictive conditions," between the I. F. T. U. and the Russian unions.

Regardless of this agreement, the Berlin meeting marked the beginning of a breach in the Anglo-Russian committee. This breach was widened when Tomskey, in September, 1926, sent a telegram to the Bournemouth conference of the British Trade Union

¹⁷ On August 12, 1926, the All-Russian Council of Trade Unions, at a plenary meeting, declared that the Russian proletariat had had "immense experience of the class struggle," that "it will not keep silent when the incorrect policy of the General Council damages the cause of the working class," and that "it wishes to assist the British proletariat both materially and ideologically."

Congress, in which abuse, criticism, and unsolicited advice were stated in bald and irritating language. The reply of the British Trade Union Congress was a sharp protest against "this ill-instructed and presumptuous criticism."

The failure of the British strikes thus not merely weakened the international labor organizations, but increased their internal strains. The strikes were hardly over when these organizations found themselves in the throes of an internal crisis which brought them near the breaking point.

CHAPTER XIV

INTERNAL CRISIS, 1926-1927

From the middle of 1926 to the end of 1927, the international labor movement represented by the organizations of "Amsterdam," "Moscow," and by the Pan-American Federation of Labor, went through an internal crisis which threatened to disrupt it completely. The crisis in each organization took the same general form, that of factional strife in which personalities, national differences, and conflicting policies were inextricably interwoven.

In the Third International, the crisis was of greater intensity and of wider scope than in all the others. Because of this, it calls for consideration first.

I. TROTSKY AND ZINOVIEV VERSUS STALIN AND BUKHARIN

1. First Encounter—1926

a. The "Opposition Bloc"

As a result of events described in preceding chapters, the Third International, by the summer of 1926, had become honey-combed with "factions" and "oppositions." In and outside of Russia, "Rights" and "ultra-Rights," "Lefts" and "ultra-

Lefts" ran in all shades of opinion. In Germany, for instance, there were at least five different groups—the Fischer-Maslov group, the Korsch group, the Scholem group, the "Wedding-Opposition,"¹ and the Urbahns group.

In Russia, the succession of "opposition" movements had created by the summer of 1926 five major "factions." There was the "Workers' opposition," which had protested since 1921 against the NEP, against what they called the suppression of free criticism within the party, and against the subordinate place of the workers in the economic life of Russia. There was the group of "Democratic Centralism" which centered its attacks on the alleged rule of the Russian Communist Party by an inner clique. The so-called "left" or "Smirnov-Sapronov group" claimed more consideration for the economic rights of the workers as distinct from the interests of the government. There was the "New Opposition" which had come forward in 1925, under the leadership of Zinoviev and Kamenev;² while combining a larger outlook and a greater variety of elements was the "opposition" of Trotsky and of the "Trotskyists."

In the summer of 1926, the leaders of the Russian "factions," Trotsky, Zinoviev, Kamenev, Smilga, Rakovsky, Radek, Preobrajensky, Piatakov, and several others of the oldest members of the Russian

¹ Wedding is an industrial section of Berlin.

² See p. 321.

Communist Party, who had been on opposite sides many times in the past, who still differed in essentials and had personal accounts among themselves, joined hands in an "opposition bloc" against Stalin, Bukharin, Rykov, Kalinin—the official spokesmen of the party administration. With the formation of this "bloc," the opposition movement in Russia assumed the character of a fight for the control of the party machinery, the Central Committee and the Central Control Committee, which were in the hands of Stalin.³ In view of the position of the Communist Party as the ruling party of Russia, it meant a struggle for power to steer Soviet Russia in its internal policies as well as in international affairs.

b. The Economics of NEP

The issues around which this personal struggle centered were the outgrowth of conditions created by the world trend towards stabilization by which Russia herself was affected, and by the developments of the NEP.⁴ Between 1923 and 1926 Russia had adopted a gold exchange standard, had made progress in restoring her agriculture owing to several good harvests and to governmental stimulation, had begun the rebuilding of her industries, and had

³ Stalin's power rests on his position as secretary of the Russian Communist Party. Under his direction, the Central Committee which consisted of 19 persons in 1920 was increased to 71 in 1927; the Central Control Commission, which was a body of five in 1920, became a body of 195. Through these enlarged committees, Stalin exercises his personal influence.

⁴ See pp. 225-226.

improved the condition of the workers and of the general population.

Under the arrangements of the NEP, however, these improvements were creating new problems for the Russian state. The NEP, while retaining the national ownership of land, placed the peasants on the basis of private individual enterprise—each peasant household having the right to use land allotted to it as it saw best and to dispose of its harvest in what it regarded as the most profitable way, selling its products either to government agencies, to co-operatives, or to private individuals. With the progress in agriculture, this led to a differentiation of the Russian village along lines which had existed before the war, namely, into the three elements of rich peasants (the so-called “kulaks”), middle peasants, and “poor” peasants—the difference being based upon their ownership of agricultural equipment and cattle, their capacity to use land, and upon their general economic prosperity.

The NEP in the village had its parallel in the towns. Here, between 1921 and 1926, it resulted in the formation of many small and medium-sized privately owned industrial enterprises, which produced for their local markets, especially for the peasant market. At the same time, privately-owned small shops and stores appeared in all the cities and towns of Russia, and a number of commission men, merchants, and private capitalists entered the business of buying grain and other agri-

cultural products from the peasantry for sale in the cities and of selling to the peasant the output of industry.

Russian economy thus assumed a complex form. The basic and large-scale industries such as mining, iron and steel, textiles, oil, the railroads, were held as national property and managed under government control by especially created institutions, known as "trusts" and "syndicates."⁵ The output of these industries was disposed of, in part directly, between the various trusts, syndicates, and government departments, partly through a marketing system which included government stores, shops owned by trusts and syndicates, and co-operative societies. But side by side with these were the stores owned by individuals, the business of the merchants and commission men, and the smaller plants and factories of artisans and of private manufacturers.

All the private enterprises in Russia, as well as the business of farming, were on a profit-making basis. But even the trusts and syndicates, though government-owned and controlled, were placed under the NEP on a "commercial basis." Though allotted capital by the central government agencies, the Supreme Economic Council and the Council of Labor and Defense, they were expected to apply this capital themselves, under certain regulations, to buy their own raw materials, to fix wages and

⁵ For a description see *Soviet Russia in the Second Decade*, edited by Chase, Dunn and Tugwell, 1928.

overhead expenses, and to sell their finished product so as to make a profit to be used partly for the expansion of their respective plants, partly for Russian industry as a whole.

In so far as the workers were concerned, the overwhelming majority of them were in the large-scale state industries. Wages, hours, and conditions of employment were fixed between them and the managers of the trusts by means of collective agreements. As the managers of the trusts and syndicates were expected to make profits in order to develop their industries, it was inevitable that they should try to bargain with the workers with a view not only to the welfare of the latter, but also to the larger plans of industrial development. Processes of "rationalization," including scientific management methods and piece work, were applied by the managers to increase productivity. The workers could rely for the protection of their interests on their trade unions, but being the "ruling class" of Russia, they were expected to take into account the needs of Russian industry and of the Soviet state.

These industrial and economic developments had also social consequences. There was emerging in Soviet Russia a new division into social classes. There were the peasants, the bulk of the population, all private enterprisers, but differentiated into the three categories of rich, middle, and poor peasants. Closely related to them in economic interests were the town middle classes—private employers and

traders, professional people, government employees—between 6 and 7 per cent of the population, and there were the several million workers in industry, trade, and transportation, not over 3 per cent of the population, who formed, however, the ruling element of the country under the system of "proletarian dictatorship."

Between these groups and classes there was an obvious struggle for the division of the national income. Between 1923 and 1926, as a result of the economic arrangements described, this struggle centered about prices and taxes. Owing to technical backwardness and to high production costs, Russian government industry was unable to supply the internal market with manufactured goods, a shortage resulted, and industrial prices rose far above world prices and out of proportion to agricultural prices.⁶ The richer and middle peasants withheld their grain from the market, upsetting on several occasions the export plans of the government and endangering the Russian exchanges. Private traders made capital out of the government's predicament, while the workers suffered from a slowing up of wage advances, from irregularities in wage payments, and from unemployment aggravated by the reappearance of a surplus population in the villages which flocked to the cities in search of seasonal work. To meet this situation, the Soviet government, under the direc-

⁶ The so-called "scissors" which caused much discussion also outside of Russia.

tion of the Communist Party, made concessions to the middle and rich peasants, allowing them to use more land and to hire more seasonal labor, shifting taxes to their advantage, and trying to change the relative levels of industrial and agricultural prices.

c. Is Russia Building Socialism?

About these developments centered the fight between the "opposition" and the Party administration. Rising above concrete issues, the "opposition" raised the question of the general direction and future of Soviet Russia. Starting from the premise that the Bolshevik Revolution had been made to establish a socialist society in Russia, the "opposition" insisted that the drift was now the other way—towards capitalism—and that the future of the Russian Revolution was in jeopardy. The party leaders, on the other hand, claimed that the cause of the revolution was making progress and that the communists were rapidly building a socialist economy within Russia.

Both the "opposition" and the Party administration proceeded on the same assumptions, namely, that industrialization, especially the development of large-scale government industry, was the only path to socialism and that a "proletarian dictatorship" was essential to promote the growth of socialist industry. They arrived at opposite ends because they diverged at the essential point, namely, in evaluating the rate at which large-scale government in-

dustry in Russia was developing. In the opinion of the "opposition," large-scale government industry, the "socialist element" of Russian economy, was not keeping pace with the general progress of the national economy, was developing less rapidly than agriculture, and was retrogressing as compared with the growth of private industry.⁷ In trade, too, private capital was overtaking the government and the co-operatives. The reverse of this was that agriculture and small-scale enterprises—that is, the "capitalistic" elements in Russia—were becoming predominant in the economic life of the country.

Here, in the opinion of the "opposition," lay the danger. As the private capitalistic elements were growing, the Soviet state and the government industries were becoming more dependent on them for food, raw materials, and export surpluses. As these resources were largely in the hands of the well-to-do peasants, the latter were acquiring economic power and using it to strengthen also their political and social influence. The "kulaks" were said to be exercising increasing pressure on the small and poor peasants in the village. They were also said to be joining with the private traders and capitalists in the towns, and with the "intellectuals" holding positions in the Soviet departments and in the gov-

⁷ Private industry, according to the "opposition," was producing more than one-fifth of the total industrial output of the country and supplying about 40 per cent of the goods to the market. Private trade was supplying about 50 per cent of the needs of the consumers.

ernment industries, to corrupt the machinery of government and the Communist Party itself.

The "opposition" claimed that the "capitalistic," or NEP, elements of Russia were getting strong enough to be able to sweep aside the economic plans of the Soviet government, to withhold grain reserves from the market, and to block exports. But small exports from Russia meant an unfavorable balance of trade, low imports of machinery, a lack of capital for the building of new and for the re-equipment of old factories, a further slowing up of industrialization, a further weakening of the industrial and collectivist elements of Russian economy. If this were allowed to continue, the NEP elements were bound to gain in consciousness of their strength, and backed by the capitalists of the world, were likely sooner or later to threaten the whole structure of the Soviet system and of the "proletarian dictatorship."

According to the "opposition," the Russian Communist Party itself was to blame for these developments. In its internal policies, it had aided not so much the poor and middle peasants, as the "kulaks," while its price policy had prevented a sufficient rise in wages. Its tax policies, which spared the peasants, had made impossible a rapid accumulation of capital for the industrialization of the country. In international affairs the Party had sidetracked the Third International from revolutionary paths, sacrificing the cause of world revolution to the alleged

immediate needs of Russian reconstruction. To justify these erroneous policies, it was doing violence to Marxist and Leninist principles by spinning a theory that it was possible for one country to build a socialist society in a general capitalistic world and that such a society was now being built in Russia. And in order to maintain itself and its policies, the administration was corrupting the whole Party, building up a "machine," suppressing freedom of discussion, persecuting its opponents, ruling out the vital elements, and packing the Party with non-workers who were like clay in the hands of Stalin, Bukharin, and of their associates and henchmen.

In reply to the "opposition," Stalin and Bukharin reversed the argument. They claimed that their policy of lowering industrial prices and of alleviating taxes in the villages was achieving two ends: it was winning the good will of the middle peasant—the mainstay of Russian agricultural life—and was stimulating the managers of industry to improve methods of production and to reduce production costs. Indirectly, it was improving also the condition of the workers because lower prices meant higher real wages. Private capital, they claimed further, was playing a subordinate part in Russian life, while the "socialistic elements" of Russian economy were gaining rapidly. They quoted Marx, Engels, and Lenin to prove the possibility of building socialism in one country, up to a certain degree. In a country like Russia, especially, a large internal

market and abundant resources made socialist construction possible with the aid of domestic savings and of foreign capital which was becoming more and more willing to invest in Russia. They argued that the building of socialism in Russia was an essential factor in promoting the international revolutionary movement; that as long as Russia remained a "proletarian dictatorship" and continued building a socialist society, it was a symbol of "the social revolution" to the rest of the world and thereby was stimulating revolutionary ideals in other countries. When another general revolutionary outbreak came, Russia would be in a position to play a leading part because of the economic, political, and military strength which it would have built up by that time. They denied that there was a lack of "democracy" within the party, but insisted that, under communist principles, no "factions" could be allowed, because factions tended to weaken party discipline and to obstruct the work of reconstruction.

d. Defeat of the "Opposition"

The "opposition" in Russia encouraged the insurgent communist elements outside of Russia in their campaign against the executive committee of the Third International. "Rights" and "ultra-Rights," "Lefts" and "ultra-Lefts" made fun of the "peasant king Stalin," repudiated the regime in Russia as no longer "proletarian" but "kulakized," denounced the "bureaucracy" and "nationalist opportunism" of the Russian Communist Party, and

called for a "revolution" against the central committee of the Russian Communist Party which was dominating the Third International. The phrase "Thermidorean reaction,"⁸ used by Trotsky to indicate an alleged parallel between the turn in the Great French Revolution and in Russia, became the rallying cry of the oppositional elements in the Third International.

An international opposition was thus formed within the Third International, of which Trotsky was the chief spokesman. Though Trotsky claimed to follow in the footsteps of Lenin, he was accused by the executives of the Third International of trying to elaborate a doctrine of his own—"Trotskyism"—in opposition to Leninism. The "Lefts" of Germany, on the other hand, were accused of trying to drive a wedge between a "Russian Leninism" and a "Western Marxism."

After some attacks and counter-attacks during the summer of 1926, it seemed for a while that the "opposition" and the Party administration would make a compromise. On October 16, 1926, the leaders of the "opposition" signed a statement in which they promised not to carry on their agitation outside the limits allowed by party regulations. However, as they disregarded their promise almost at once, the executives of the Third International tried more radical measures. Trotsky was excluded from the Politbureau of the Russian Communist Party. Zino-

⁸ Thermidor designated the overthrow of Robespierre in 1794.

view was made to resign the presidency of the Third International. The most vociferous "Rights" and "Lefts" in various countries were expelled.⁹

In this way, the decision was predetermined for the battle which came at the two communist gatherings of November-December, 1926, namely, at the fifteenth conference of the Russian Communist Party and at the session of the Enlarged Executive Committee of the Third International. For several weeks the battle was fought with long and numerous quotations from Marx, Engels, and Lenin on both sides, and with barrages of statistics which both sides quoted in support of their contradictory contentions. From the very start, however; it was clear that the "opposition" was fighting a losing battle. At both communist gatherings, Stalin's and Bukharin's policies were approved. The "relative stabilization" of world capitalism was reaffirmed, the retardation of the world revolution was acknowledged, the various slogans of the "United Front," "United States of Socialist Europe," "Bolshevization" were readopted. Russia was declared to be building socialism and for that reason was the "center of the international revolution." The leadership of the Russian Communist Party was reasserted, though all other sections were to be given a larger share in mapping out their own policies.

⁹ Souvarine, Rosmer, Monatte in France; Korsch, Ruth Fischer, Maslov, Scholem, Urbahns in Germany; and leaders in other countries of Europe and in the United States.

2. Main Battle—1927

a. The Chinese Dragon and the British Lion

But these meetings were hardly over, when the "Russian opposition" was again on the offensive, while the campaign of the "Lefts" outside of Russia became more unrestrained. Shifting somewhat its position with changing events, the "opposition" focused its attacks during 1927 on three points: the revolution in China, Anglo-Russian relations, and the so-called Five-Year Plan of the Gosplan.¹⁰

Developments in China had been in the center of communist interest all during 1926. With the first successes of the Canton Nationalists early in 1926, the Russian communist leaders had begun to place great hopes in China, as a "phase of the world revolution." The communist outlook was based on a detailed analysis of Chinese economic and social conditions. From this analysis,¹¹ the Russian commu-

¹⁰ The Gosplan is the abbreviated form of the Russian name for the State Planning Board whose function it is to map the course of Russian industrial and economic development.

¹¹ According to this analysis, the mass of the Chinese population, over 50 million families, was composed of the peasantry, of which 50 per cent cultivated small farms of less than five acres. Though the number of large land-holders was comparatively small, except in a few provinces, they and the richer peasants owned over half the cultivable area and rented out part of their lands to the poorer elements. The starvation-life of the Chinese peasants was said to be due to high land rents, burdensome leases, numerous taxes, impositions by war lords and officials, and to feudalistic and patriarchal survivals.

Under these conditions, an "agrarian revolution" in China was declared inevitable. It was necessary to confiscate the lands belonging to the large landowners, to the missionaries and monas-

nists concluded that the revolution in China was similar to the Russian Revolution of 1905, agrarian-industrial-democratic in character. But, in view of the general position of the Third International, the communists had to find a place for the Chinese situation in the general picture of world developments. If capitalism was being "stabilized," the Chinese Revolution had either to help or hinder that process. A way out was found by refining the analysis of capitalist stabilization. The world was divided into spheres in which processes were said to differ. In Western Europe and in the United States "stabilization" was in the ascendancy; in Russia, there was socialist construction; while in China and in other colonial countries capitalism was being rammed down by revolutionary uprisings.

It was possible to assume, on the basis of this analysis, that the Chinese Revolution might develop

teries, to bring about a reduction in land rents, abolish many of the taxes, make land leases easy, and provide cheap credit.

As to the other elements of the population, the communists counted about five million workers, of whom about two million were engaged in modern industrial plants; some eight million artisans, several million merchants, small employers, and professional people belonging to the middle classes, and a small number of the "big bourgeoisie" in control of large industries, banks, and transport. Of these elements, in communist analysis, the big bourgeoisie and some sections of the middle classes were chiefly interested in doing away with foreign control in China; the lower middle classes and the "intellectuals" were eager for national freedom, and for a democratic regime, while the workers were concerned also with an immediate improvement in their economic position and with preparing the ground for their advance in the future.

a wider economic and social character, namely that the workers and the peasants might establish a dictatorial government for the purpose of carrying out a large socialist program. In the Chinese Communist Party which grew rapidly during 1925-26, there was a "Left wing" which held this view and which wanted to act accordingly.

But the executive committee of the Third International steered a middle course. It held out the hope that the Chinese Revolution might assume a "wider social character" and that it would result in the establishment of a "revolutionary anti-imperialist government of transition to non-capitalist development." At the same time, it censured the Chinese "Lefts" for their extravagant claims, directed the Chinese Communist Party to co-operate with the Kuo-Min-Tang,¹² and prepared a mixed program which, while containing far-reaching demands for the nationalization of the Chinese railways and waterways and for the confiscation of large enterprises and banks, stressed immediate agrarian and labor reforms.

From the fall of 1926 to the spring of 1927, with the success of the nationalist governments at Hankow, Nanking, and Shanghai, the Third International extended its influence in China.¹³ Peasants'

¹² The Kuo-Min-Tang is the National People's Party, organized by Dr. Sun-Yat-Sen, which assumed leadership in the nationalist reorganization of China.

¹³ At its third congress in May, 1927, in Hankow, the Chinese Communist Party reported that the membership of the Party

unions spread throughout the southern and central provinces, establishing themselves as a political power in the villages, while the trade unions rapidly grew in membership in the cities, organized armed workers' guards, and proceeded to enforce their economic demands by strikes and otherwise. Using China as a base, the R. I. L. U. tried to consolidate its influence in the Far East by calling a Pan-Pacific Trade Union conference and organizing in May, 1927, a Pan-Pacific Secretariat of Labor.

The "opposition" bitterly criticized the policy of the Third International in China as "opportunist" and as dictated entirely by the national interests of the Russian state. The "opposition" warned the Third International that Chang-Kai-Shek and the other leaders of the Kuo-Min-Tang would soon turn against the communists. The "opposition" was in sympathy with the "Left" Chinese communists who were for striking out independently.

By the middle of the summer of 1927, the sharp turn in the Chinese situation seemed to bear out the predictions of the "opposition." The Peking raids on the Soviet consulate, the expulsion of the Chinese Communist Party from the Kuo-Min-Tang, the wholesale execution of communists, the breaking up

had grown from 994 early in 1925 to about 58,000. The Young Communists of China numbered 35,000. The membership of the trade unions affiliated with the R. I. L. U. was said to have jumped from 150,000 in 1925 to 2,800,000. While the various "peasants' unions" had increased their membership for the same period from 200,000 to 9,829,000.

of the peasants' organizations and of the trade unions by the nationalist generals—all indicated a collapse of the influence of the Third International in China. The executive committee of the Third International, following Bukharin and Stalin, explained the new turn in the situation by the inevitable development of class antagonisms and blamed the Chinese communists for having disobeyed instructions and for having failed to arm the workers and peasants. Keeping to its middle course, it instructed the Chinese communists to stay in the Kuo-Min-Tang and in the Hankow government, but at the same time to stir up the labor and agrarian movements and to strengthen its hold on the army. It was soon seen, however, that the Third International had played its cards in China and for the time being had fallen on the losing side.

Closely connected with developments in China was the quarrel between the "opposition" and the Party administration over Anglo-Russian relations. When the British government raided the Arcos¹⁴ in London in May, 1927, and then broke off diplomatic relations, the Russian communists accused Great Britain of planning a war against Soviet Russia. "To stop the impending war," the Russian trade union leaders demanded that the Anglo-Russian Committee be called at once. The British trade unionists, however, hardly recovered from the strikes

¹⁴ The Arcos—The Anglo-Russian Co-operative Society—is the organization which carries on trade between Russia and England.

of 1926, facing anti-trade-union legislation,¹⁵ irritated by the activities of the communists in the British trade unions, showed no eagerness for meeting the Russians and adopted a policy of procrastination.

The "opposition" claimed that there was no serious danger of war and that the Russian communist leaders were stirring up a war scare to serve their purposes. In Trotsky's words, the bureaucracy of the Russian Communist Party was more dangerous to the communist cause than Austen Chamberlain. The "opposition" attacked the Anglo-Russian Committee, claiming that the British members of it were "traitors" and "opportunists," and demanded the dissolution of the Committee.

b. The Gosplan and the "Opposition" Program

In so far as internal policy in Russia was concerned, the "opposition" now directed its shafts against the Five Year Plan of the Gosplan covering the five-year period from 1927 to 1932. This plan contained the measures which the Soviet government was to take in further developing Russian industry, in improving the economic condition of the country, in elevating the standards of living of the workers, in matters of taxation and financial

¹⁵ The Trade Union Bill directed against general and sympathetic strikes and restricting somewhat the political activities of the unions was passed by the House of Commons on June 23, 1927, by a vote of 354 to 139.

policy. The "opposition" attacked the Plan on the grounds that it justified all the fears which the "opposition" had expressed before. According to the "opposition," the funds allotted for the development of large-scale government industry were inadequate to bring it up to the level which would make it the predominant element in Russian life and capable of supplying the growing needs of the country for manufactured goods.

In so far as labor was concerned, the "opposition" argued that though the increase in wages in Russia since 1923 had not kept pace with the increased productivity of labor, though the unemployed were living directly or indirectly at the expense of the employed, though the material position of the unskilled, of seasonal workers, and of women and juvenile workers was particularly hard, the Plan made but slight provisions for improvement. Not enough was allowed for wage increases, for improving housing conditions, for increasing the insurance funds of the unemployed. Also in matters of taxation, the "opposition" detected in the Plan evidence that a greater burden would be thrown upon the workers in the cities who already paid the greater share of the direct taxes and that not enough would be contributed by the agricultural population. The Five-Year Plan also provided for a large increase in the production of alcoholic spirits, as a source of revenue, which threatened an increase of drunkenness in the country.

As the "opposition" saw it, the salvation of Russia demanded a forcible acceleration of the industrialization of the country, by means of a radical redistribution of the national income by the use of the budget, credits, and prices, and by retrenchment in state expenditures. Their program called for a compulsory loan on the rich peasants and for an excess tax on private enterprise which would enable the government to make net grants from the budget for the needs of industry of 500 million to one billion rubles annually during the next five years; for an energetic policy of systematic and constant reduction of wholesale and retail prices, but in such manner that prices should be reduced first on articles of consumption used by the workers and peasants; for greater economy in management to reduce unproductive expenditures; for a proper choice of persons from the lowest to the highest positions; for a decrease of labor turnover; for a stable currency and a sound money condition; for restrictions on speculation and usury so as to mobilize all private savings in the service of the state; for a reduction in distributive costs ¹⁶ and for various betterments in the condition of labor. In communist terms, the opposition was for abandoning the policy of an "alliance" between the industrial workers and the richer peasantry in favor of a sharper "class struggle" and of

¹⁶ The "opposition" claimed that these costs swallowed up about 19 per cent of the national income as compared with 8½ per cent before the war.

an accentuated "proletarian dictatorship." Internationally, they were for reviving the aggressive tactics of the Third International and for supporting the "Left groups" in the various countries. And to put such a change of policy into effect they demanded a purging of the Party of "bureaucrats" and "careerists," wider admission of workers, and freedom of "factions," that is, the right of "groups" within the Party to agitate for their ideas and policies.

c. The Rout

The "opposition" tried to use every session of the executive committees of the Russian Party as well as the sessions of the Third International for the presentation of its views. The plan of the "opposition" was to build up an organization of its own within the Third International so as to overturn the leadership and to step into power instead. In Russia, local and central committees were formed, while the "opposition" groups in Western Europe organized an International Left Communist Federation for the same purpose.

In the course of 1927 the "opposition" in Russia became bolder.¹⁷ It organized illegal printing plants

¹⁷ Two episodes attracted much attention. One was a secret meeting, arranged by the "opposition" in the woods beyond Sparrow Hills, on the outskirts of Moscow.

Another was the "battle of portraits" at the Yaroslavl Railroad Station in Moscow. Smilga, one of the "opposition" leaders, ordered to Siberia, was to leave from that station. His followers staged a demonstration for him, decorating the waiting rooms of

to print its own literature. The Party administration accused the "opposition" of trying to build up a "second party" in Russia which was regarded as completely at variance with communist principles and as a high crime against communist party discipline.

After several warnings and reprimands, the Central Control Commission of the Communist Party of Russia held a meeting in August, 1927, to consider the expulsion of Zinoviev and Trotsky from the executive committee of the Russian Party. Somewhat impressed by this move, Trotsky, Zinoviev, Kamenev, Rakovsky, Piatakov, made a declaration on August 11, 1927, that they were absolutely and unreservedly for the defense of their "socialist fatherland"; that they opposed all attempts to form a "second party" in Russia, but that they would defend their ideas and would demand the readmission of the expelled groups in Germany. However, the "opposition" continued its agitation as before. During the celebrations of the tenth anniversary of the Bolshevik Revolution, it staged demonstrations in Moscow and Petrograd which spoiled somewhat the holiday spirit of the occasion.

It was then that the Russian Communist Party and the Third International took the final steps. In October, 1927, Trotsky was excluded from the executive committee of the Third International. In

the station with the portraits of Trotsky, Zinoviev, and Kamenev, which had not been seen there for some time.

November, Zinoviev and Trotsky were expelled from the Communist Party of Russia and at the congress of the Russian Communist Party in December, 1927, the ax fell upon 100 odd leaders of the "opposition,"¹⁸ while immediately thereafter the Enlarged Executive Committee of the Third International approved the action of the Russian Communist Party and expelled a number of those in various countries who sympathized with the "Trotskyist" opposition. The administration forces led by Stalin, Bukharin, and Rykov, triumphed, remaining in control of the Russian Communist Party and of the Third International.

II. A CONFLICT OF CAPITALS

1. "Amsterdam's" Affairs

Less acute was the crisis which came to a head during the same period in "Amsterdam." After the British strikes, loss in membership and weakened finances created a feeling in "Amsterdam" that the British demands were too great a strain on the organization. The British strikes had also shown that the Amsterdam Bureau and the Trade Secretariats were not well co-ordinated for cases of emergency. And as a result of the activities of the Anglo-Russian Committee, there had accumulated bad personal feelings within the Bureau which were obstructing the work of the organization.

¹⁸ Several thousand "opposition" members were excluded from the Communist Party of Russia, imprisoned, or exiled. Trotsky was exiled to Turkestan.

The moderate element, or "Right wing," of "Amsterdam," led by Oudegeest, Jouhaux, Sassenbach, Leipart, Mertens, were determined to face these problems openly. In so far as the "Russian question" was concerned, they put an end to it early in 1927 when the British brought it up again at a session of the executive committee. On February 24 and 25, 1927, the majority of the committee ruled that no change could be made in the situation as fixed by the decisions of the Vienna congress in 1924 and of the Amsterdam Council in February and December, 1925.¹⁹

With the Trade Secretariats, a new arrangement was reached at a conference held on July 30 and 31, 1927. New rules were adopted, according to which the Trade Secretariats were no longer to be represented on the Amsterdam Council. Instead, "Amsterdam" was to convene a special annual conference of the secretaries of the Trade Secretariats to meet with the Amsterdam Council for the consideration of common problems. A division of functions was agreed on in rendering strike aid; in case of strikes in which the workers of one industry alone in any country were involved, the raising of funds was from now on to be left to the Trade Secretariats in that industry; "Amsterdam" was to intervene only in cases where workers of several industries were concerned. Provisions were also made for greater unity between "Amsterdam" and the Trade Secre-

¹⁹ See pp. 314-315.

tariats. "Amsterdam" was to extend aid in bringing within the Trade Secretariats the unions in the different countries, while the Trade Secretariats agreed to confine their activities to trade matters and to consider "Amsterdam" as the representative organization for the larger economic and social policies of labor.

2. Sensations of Paris

While these changes were made smoothly, the readjustment in which the British "Left wing" was involved, caused friction. It took place at the fourth regular congress of "Amsterdam" which was held in Paris from the 1st to the 6th of August, 1927. At the very opening of the congress, Purcell, as president, made a speech which created a stir because of its "Leftness." Jouhaux at once in the name of himself and of his colleagues declared that Purcell had made the speech on his own responsibility and that the Amsterdam Bureau did not agree with it. Several British delegates protested against Jouhaux's protest, backing up Purcell. The British delegation took the censure of Purcell as somewhat of a national offense and as an alignment of the Bureau against England.

On the second day of the congress, a new incident was created by John W. Brown's statement that in the negotiations with Russia, the Amsterdam Bureau had not played fair. He quoted from a private letter sent by Oudegeest to Jouhaux in 1925, in

which Oudegeest had evidently tried to prevent an agreement with the Russians. Supporting Brown, Citrine charged the Bureau with hypocrisy in its dealings with the Russians.

As these two incidents brought out in a personal and practical way the underlying issues of the congress, they became the focus of attention. Interest centered especially on "committee one" which was appointed to examine into the "Brown-Oudegeest affair."

On the last day of the congress "committee one" made its report. Before that, Oudegeest had tendered his resignation as secretary. The report of the committee on the whole upheld Oudegeest. The British protested against it as a deliberate effort "to whitewash Oudegeest." Citrine said that Oudegeest's letter had shaken confidence in the integrity of "Amsterdam" and that it was not the duty of the committee to exonerate the secretary, but to state the facts. He demanded that the letter be read in full.

Oudegeest defended himself and complained that for three years the intrigues of the Anglo-Russian Committee had rendered his life insufferable. He claimed that his letter had no such meaning as was ascribed to it, and asked why Brown had not exposed it before, since it was two years old. He attacked Brown for what he regarded as questionable behavior.

Grassman read Oudegeest's letter in full, but it

added little to the debate. The congress endorsed the report of "committee one" by an overwhelming majority.

3. Berlin versus London

Conflict broke out again during the elections. The British delegation was instructed to vote for Purcell for re-election as president of the Amsterdam Council. The rest of the congress were determined not to have Purcell in any case, though they were willing to have an Englishman as president. Leipart nominated Hicks against Purcell. Hicks declared that the British were committed to Purcell. However, when the British nominated Purcell for president, the Swiss nominated Hicks again. After some hesitation on the part of the British, Citrine declared that unless the Hicks nomination was withdrawn, the British delegation would leave the hall. The Swiss then withdrew Hicks' name. But Leipart announced that the German, Dutch, Swedish, and Danish delegates would not accept Purcell, and nominated Hicks once more. The British delegation then left the hall, accompanied by the delegates from Palestine, South Africa, and India. The rest of the delegates proceeded to vote, electing as members of the Amsterdam Bureau Hicks, Jouhaux, Leipart, Madsen, Mertens, and Tayerle. In the voting, 19 countries with 69 votes participated, while four countries with 18 votes abstained.

These proceedings were regarded as a setback for the British and as a "come-back" for the Germans. For it was the latter who led the fight against the British "Left," and who carried the day, in alliance with the Scandinavians and supported by the French and Belgians.

Besides effecting a shift in relative influence, the Paris congress made a thorough change in organization. Both Oudegeest's and Brown's resignations were accepted and their offices abolished. The I. F. T. U. was to have only one general secretary. The General Council was enlarged and the Management Committee was reorganized. A proposal to change completely the structure of the I. F. T. U. so as to make it a federation of Trade Secretariats was rejected, and the new agreement with the Trade Secretariats was endorsed. In addition, it was decided to overhaul the administrative offices and to remove headquarters to a new city. This, however, the congress left to the General Council, instructing it to appoint a sub-committee for the purpose of reorganizing the Bureau and the office, and of selecting a general secretary and for removing the headquarters.

While the demonstrative manner in which the British left the Paris congress heartened the communists, their comfort was not to last long. On September 8, 1927, the British Trade Union Congress meeting at Edinburgh, by a vote of 2,551,000 against 620,000, decided to break off all relations

with the All-Russian Council of Trade Unions, thus ending the career of the Anglo-Russian Committee.

III. AMERICAN DRIFTS

Weakened by economic and political developments in Europe, "Amsterdam," between 1925 and 1927, turned more eagerly towards the A. F. of L. Oudegeest, following Sassenbach, struck a new note of consideration in his correspondence with William Green, the new president of the A. F. of L., expressing willingness to make concessions to American demands. Oudegeest was willing to come to America to discuss the situation, and also invited the leaders of the A. F. of L. to visit Europe for the same purpose.

In some ways, conditions after 1924 stimulated a more friendly interest on the part of the A. F. of L. towards "Amsterdam." In accord with the rest of the nation, American labor was experiencing a renewed interest in Europe, more American labor leaders were "going abroad," and coming into personal contact with European labor organizations. Also the recognition which the A. F. of L. received from the American government in appointments to international conferences and commissions made the leaders of the A. F. of L. readier for participation in international affairs.²⁰

²⁰ American labor was given special representation in the councils of the American delegation to the International Economic Conference, held in Geneva in May, 1927, through the appointment of John P. Frey as special labor expert and adviser.

But in other ways, developments tended to weaken the ties between the A. F. of L. and "Amsterdam." Owing to the new immigration laws of 1921 and 1924, American labor felt secure against competition from abroad. Because of America's attitude towards the League of Nations, the A. F. of L. took a decreasing interest in the International Labor Office. Also the communist issue became less important as a connecting link. For, beginning with 1924, the A. F. of L. took the offensive against the Trade Union Educational League and its "Left wing" sympathizers, and soon weakened the communist hold in those unions where it was strongest.

Of greatest importance, however, was the fact that the A. F. of L. was now faced by industrial and social problems which had been forming since the war and which now called for all the energies which the A. F. of L. could muster. The extension of mass production to new industries, the wide application of power, the standardization of technical processes, the migration of old industries to new sections of the country, the rapid development of the automotive and electrical industries, all combined to make a "new industrialism" in America. With these industrial changes went a downward trend of the price level and rising wages, increased total output with a decrease in the number of workers employed. Using the advantages offered by these developments, an increasing number of employers began to apply systematically new labor policies—forming employee

organizations, remedying grievances, raising wages, shortening hours, providing protection against old age and sickness, thus trying to give their workers that for which workers in the past had looked to the trade unions.

In defense against this "new capitalism" and the "company union,"²¹ American labor came forward with four weapons. One of these were the new activities such as labor banking, workers' education, co-operative housing, which were intended to open up new vistas for workers and to show the larger capacities of the trade union. Another was the greater emphasis on welfare, such as group insurance, old-age homes, sanatoriums, summer camps. A third was the "New Wage Policy" based on the idea that labor is entitled to a share in the increased national income due to industrial progress, and whose implication is that only organizations by, for, and of labor, can win for labor such a wage. The fourth weapon was the greater effort to convince employers of the "constructive and co-operative" capacity of the trade union in promoting productivity and business stability as against its militant aspects, provided employers were willing to reach a mutual understanding with labor for common ends.

In the use of these new devices, the A. F. of L.

²¹ "Company union" is the term applied by labor to most employee representation schemes to indicate the fact of their dependence on employers.

was only partly successful. Success was limited to trade unions which were in industries especially favored by prosperity or in which there happened to be a peculiar combination of economic and personal factors; such were the trade unions in the building trades, in the printing trades, in the shops of a few railroads such as the Baltimore and Ohio Railroad, in the men's clothing industry. But as against these, unions in the semi-skilled trades suffered severely as instanced by the United Mine Workers, the International Ladies' Garment Workers' Union, and others. The total effect was one of loss for the A. F. of L. in membership, in income, in organizing capacity, in economic power, and in social influence.²²

Absorbed in these domestic problems, the leaders of the A. F. of L., pursued but mildly the suggestions made by Gompers during his last days. Negotiations between the A. F. of L. and "Amsterdam" during 1925-1927, therefore, though friendly in tone, made no progress. The Los Angeles Convention of 1927 reiterated the demands of the A. F. of L. for a reduction in the per capita tax and for a change in the constitution of the I. F. T. U. to make decisions binding only if passed by a unanimous vote. On that basis, the executive council of the A. F. of L. was again instructed to continue its

²² The membership of the A. F. of L. decreased from 4,078,000 in 1920 to 3,195,000 in 1922; to 2,865,000 in 1924; and to 2,803,900 in 1926.

efforts to reach "satisfactory arrangements" for the reaffiliation of the A. F. of L. with the I. F. T. U.

Though the A. F. of L. continued to stay out of the I. F. T. U., individual trade unions belonging to the A. F. of L. extended their international affiliations on a larger scale than before the war. Some twelve American trade unions with a combined membership of 1,500,000 joined their respective International Trade Secretariats between 1924 and 1927. Through these affiliations, over 50 per cent of the membership of the A. F. of L. became connected indirectly during these years with the I. F. T. U.

IV. PAN-AMERICAN STRAINS

While facing new and complex internal problems, the leaders of the A. F. of L. were beset almost at once, after Gompers' death, with increasing difficulties in the Pan-American Federation of Labor. Aside from the effects of American policy in Nicaragua, tension developed in the relations of the A. F. of L. and of Mexican labor, the very basis of the Pan-American Federation of Labor.

Two issues caused this strain. One was the conflict between the Calles' government and the Catholic Church in Mexico. Some of the Catholic members of the A. F. of L. claimed that the C. R. O. M. was the main support of the Calles' government, and was responsible for Calles' religious policies. At the Detroit convention of the A. F. of L. in October, 1926, an attack was made on the C. R. O. M.,

inspired in part by Catholic zeal, in part by economic influences, on the grounds that it was not a real trade union organization, but part of the machinery of the Mexican government. The demand was made that the A. F. of L. clear "its skirt of the slime which has attached to it through the deception practiced" on its Executive Council by "the paid propagandists of Bolshevist Mexico," which was a veiled demand for a break between the A. F. of L. and the C. R. O. M.

The other issue was the growing immigration of Mexicans into the United States under the Immigration Act of 1924, which exempted Mexico from the quota provisions of the law. Anticipating friction, C. A. Vargas had suggested, in April, 1925, to President Green that as Mexican immigration into the United States was becoming serious and a demand for the application of the quota law to Mexico was likely, "the sting could be taken out of" the necessary regulations if the two labor federations could agree upon a program to be carried out by their respective governments.

In August, 1925, representatives of the A. F. of L. and the C. R. O. M. adopted a set of principles which declared that "the ultimate condition of mankind" should allow for the "freest possible right to travel freely to every part of the world in pursuit of happiness and well-being," but that "meanwhile there was a "universal obligation" upon "every person to refrain from so ordering his movements . . .

as to endanger the standards and conditions of life . . . on the part of any groups which he may seek to enter." The two federations agreed to set up this "principle of self-restraint" in order to avoid the need of restrictive legislation.

These new as well as the older issues involved in Pan-American labor relations engaged the attention of the fifth congress of the Pan-American Federation of Labor which met in Washington on July 18, 1927. To all appearances, this was the most representative congress held since the first in Laredo, in 1918. Forty delegates from 13 countries were present, while five other countries were said to have appointed delegates who failed to arrive.²³

However, the representation at the congress was in itself a revelation of the confusion in the Pan-American labor movement. The Venezuelan delegate, for instance, was an exile living in the United States connected with the revolutionary movement for the overthrow of the dictatorship of President Gomez. On the other hand, the delegates from Cuba not only represented small, local, and doubtful organizations, but were supporters of President Machado, who was accused of having forcibly dissolved the trade unions of Cuba and of having caused the persecution of labor leaders obnoxious

²³ In addition to the United States and Mexico, the countries represented included Guatemala, San Salvador, Honduras, Nicaragua, and Panama; Cuba, Porto Rico, and the Dominican Republic; Colombia, Venezuela, and Peru.

to him. Of a similar type were the delegates from Peru.

Aside from those mentioned, most of the other delegations from outside of the United States represented trade unions recognized, and to some extent supported, by their governments. There were no delegates from the anti-governmental, anti-political, syndicalistic trade unions which are still either in the lead or in second position in the South American countries. The leading trade union organization of Argentina, the *Confederación Obrera Argentina*, under the influence of moderate socialists, refused to be represented because Iglesias, secretary of the Pan-American Federation of Labor, had sent invitations and blank credentials to the South American embassies in Washington for transmission to the labor organizations of their respective countries. Iglesias justified his procedure on the ground that no means of direct communication were available; but to the Argentine trade union leaders it appeared as if the Pan-American Federation of Labor was lending its support to non-labor governments and was acting as "one of the agencies by which the United States Department of State was trying to extend its influence."

In essentials, the fifth congress of the Pan-American Federation of Labor differed but little from the preceding ones. It reaffirmed the declaration of principles for which the Pan-American Federation of Labor stands—political freedom, education, in-

dustrial democracy, collective bargaining, autonomy in the internal affairs of the affiliated national labor organizations, the promotion of international labor relations only through mutual agreement. As at previous congresses, several of the resolutions dealing with political subjects caused heated debate. Such was the case with the resolution by Solomon de Selva, delegate from the Nicaraguan Federation of Labor, protesting against American intervention in Nicaragua; with a resolution protesting against the killing of Haitian workers by American marines; and especially with the resolution by the delegates from Nicaragua and Venezuela denouncing the "frankly imperialistic character of the United States government," declaring the Monroe Doctrine an "instrument for United States imperialism." None of these resolutions was passed as proposed. Matthew Woll, heading the committee on resolutions, insisted not only on eliminating denunciatory wording, but on smoothing out the sharp edges of some of the ideas. Thus, the substitute for the last resolution merely criticized the misapplications and the "strained interpretations" of the Monroe Doctrine, and declared against the use of force on behalf of investors in foreign lands who seek privileges above the rights of the native citizens.

Without much debate, the congress approved proposals for shorter hours and social legislation in the various countries, including a proposal for the appointment by all governments of labor attachés in

their consular service. To promote these purposes, especially the organization of the wage-earners into trade unions, it was again decided to send a commission to the Latin-American countries, the expenses for this commission to be shared by the affiliated organizations.

Early in August, 1927, an American-Mexican Labor Immigration and Emigration Conference met in Washington and drafted an agreement for putting into effect the policy of "self-restraint" proclaimed in August, 1925. The A. F. of L. obligated itself to maintain the present immigration policy of the United States, placing Mexico on a non-quota basis. The representatives of the C. R. O. M. agreed to petition the Mexican government to adopt a restrictive policy including "all peoples of Oriental birth or extraction" and conforming in general to "the Immigration Law requirements of the United States." To supplement such governmental policy, the Mexican trade unions were to discourage Mexican workers from coming to the United States or Canada. Whenever and wherever Mexican workers did come to the United States or Canada, they were to be urged to join the unions affiliated with the A. F. of L. on penalty of being disciplined by the C. R. O. M. upon their return home. On the other hand, the American and Canadian unions were to give Mexican workers every opportunity and encouragement to join on an equal footing with all other workers.

This agreement was attacked at the Los Angeles convention of the A. F. of L., in October, 1927, by delegates from the Southwest and Far West who pointed to the increasing immigration of Mexicans into the United States as evidence of the inefficiency of the "policy of self-restraint." The convention, however, ratified the agreement. At the same time the Executive Council of the A. F. of L. presented to the convention a memorandum on the organization and policies of the C. R. O. M. which emphasized the independence of the C. R. O. M. from the Calles' Government. This report was accepted by both Catholics and Protestants determined to keep the religious issue out of the American labor movement.

CHAPTER XV

ADJUSTMENTS AND REALIGNMENTS

During 1928, economic and political events continued to strengthen the trends noted since 1924. Industrial peace was brought to the fore as a major issue by employers and employees in Great Britain, Holland, Australia, and the United States. Legislation in favor of compulsory arbitration, of industrial courts, or of a system of legally binding collective agreements was furthered in Sweden, Norway, Poland, and other countries. In the field of social insurance, an enlargement of legislation was made in France, Germany, and elsewhere. Politically, the year was marked by electoral successes of socialists and communists in Germany, Poland, and several other countries of Europe. The United German Social Democratic Party emerged again as the strongest socialist party of Europe.

In the trade union world, the year showed a strengthening of the organizations of Central and Western Europe, excepting England, which was still struggling with the after-effects of the strikes of 1926. On the American continent, labor organization either marked time or suffered a setback as in

Mexico. In Asia and Africa there was a growth of trade unions, especially in the Union of South Africa, Egypt, India, and Japan, while in China the mushroom trade unionism of 1927 was wiped out, leaving in its place the more solid, though smaller, trade unions of older formation.

In the international labor movement, events were concerned with liquidating the accounts left over after the crisis of 1926-27, and with mapping the course for the near future. Special meetings, conferences and congresses were held to revise programs, change tactics, and solidify organization.¹ The international organizations came out of this process markedly changed.

"Amsterdam" spent most of the year patching up the rifts caused at the Paris congress. The leaders of the British Trade Union Congress made it clear that their behavior in Paris did not mean a break with "Amsterdam," merely a demonstration against what they regarded as wrong procedure. They took part in negotiations for reorganization, which were begun soon after the Paris congress. Proposals were made to transfer headquarters to Brussels or Berlin. A settlement was at last reached at a special meeting of the General Council on September 25-26. Walter Citrine, secretary of the British Trade Union Con-

¹ The Red International of Labor Unions held its congress in March; the Syndicalist International in May; the Socialist International in August; the Third International from July to September; the Christian International in September. Congresses were held by a number of International Trade Secretariats.

gress, was elected president of the I. F. T. U., Johann Sassenbach was appointed general secretary, while Amsterdam was retained as headquarters of the organization until further action by the congress of the I. F. T. U. in 1930.

Besides questions of reorganization, "Amsterdam" was much preoccupied during the year with its relations to the International Labor Organization in Geneva. The request of the British government, made through its delegate in the Governing Body of the I. L. O. in February, to revise the Eight-Hour Convention, exploded a bomb in the labor movements of Europe. Albert Thomas' visit to Italy where he made speeches which were interpreted as an endorsement of Fascist trade unionism, also aroused some resentment. These two incidents impelled "Amsterdam" to focus attention on the defense of the eight-hour day and on the problem of strengthening its influence in the I. L. O.

In this connection, "Amsterdam" co-operated closely with the Socialist International. The latter made a step further towards consolidation during the year as was shown by its congress held in Brussels in August. An important feature of the congress was the comeback of the German Social Democratic Party, whose marked success in the elections of 1928 and whose prestige as the leading government party of Germany brought it back into a position of influence.

In the communist movement the main develop-

ments of the year were the weakening of the "opposition," the change in the tactics of the "United Front," and the adoption of a new program for the Third International. In the course of the year, there was a steady stream of retractions on the part of leaders of the "Russian opposition" who asked for readmission to the Party.² Only Trotsky and the "Sapronov group" remained steadfast. Trotsky, from his place of exile in Turkestan, tried to mobilize his followers and sympathizers in and outside of Russia for the purpose of capturing the Russian Communist Party and the Third International. But his plans were frustrated.

Outside of Russia, the "Left" communists continued to organize along independent lines. In Germany, the "Ruth Fischer-Maslov group" and the "Urbahns group" formed a "Leninist League" which put up its own candidates in the elections to the Reichstag. The "oppositional" groups in France and Poland acted in similar fashion. Still, they could muster but small force, and showed themselves incapable of rising above the position of dissident groups.

The turn-about in the policy of the "United Front" was made early in the year and was sanctioned by the sixth congress of the Third International. Politically, this resulted in France in the refusal of the communists to support socialist candi-

² Among the outstanding leaders who "capitulated" were Zinoviev, Kamenev, Piatakov, and Smilga.

dates on the second ballot in the elections to the Chamber of Deputies in April. In England, the communists put up independent candidates against those of the Labor Party in local by-elections.

With regard to the trade unions, the communists revised the slogans of "unity." The Russian trade unions dropped their efforts to affiliate with "Amsterdam," to enter the Trade Secretariats, or to re-establish the Anglo-Russian Committee. On the contrary, they started a more vigorous campaign against "Amsterdam" and tried to build up new international contacts. An entering wedge was offered them by the Inter-Scandinavian Trade Union Committees which have been maintained for many years by the trade unions of Sweden, Norway, Denmark, and Finland. The Russian trade unions requested admission to these committees, and an attempt was made by the All-Russian Trade Union Council to gain admission to the Scandinavian Trade Union Council. The Russians were supported in this by the Finns and Norwegians, but successfully opposed by the Swedes and Danes.

Outside of Europe the R. I. L. U. tried to strengthen the Pan-Pacific Secretariat and to put into action a Latin-American Secretariat of Labor. The latter was intended as a move against the Pan-American Federation of Labor.

In consequence of these developments, relations between the various Internationals did not improve during the year. The British Independent

Labor Party sent out, early in the year, a "manifesto" to all socialist parties to consider unity with the communists. But this move found little response. On the contrary, in most countries, feeling against the communists grew in bitterness, especially in England and in the United States, where many trade unions put up restrictions barring communists from many activities.

Neither was much progress made in the relations of "Amsterdam" and the A. F. of L. or in the Pan-American Federation of Labor. Though willing to agree on the per capita tax, the Executive Council of the A. F. of L. continued to emphasize the question of "strict autonomy" as the "stumbling block to active affiliation" with "Amsterdam," and was supported in its attitude by the New Orleans convention in November 1928. In the Pan-American Federation of Labor little improvement took place in personal contacts or in the collection of information about industrial and labor conditions in Latin America.³ In American-Mexican labor relations a change was made by the decision of the New Orleans convention to abandon the "principle of self-restraint" and to demand legislation which would bring Mexico under the quota provisions of the United States immigration laws.

While adversely affected by the setback of the

³ The P. A. F. of L. has now only one secretary, Santiago Iglesias. Chester M. Wright, the English-speaking secretary, resigned in 1927.

CROM, the Pan-American Federation of Labor had to face increasing opposition from its rivals. Besides the communistic Latin-American Secretariat—Confederación Sindical Latino Americana—the anarchistic-syndicalistic trade unions made a new effort to form a Latin-American Syndicalist Federation. Also, some of the trade unions of Argentina, Uruguay, Venezuela, and Cuba, which are friendly to or affiliated with "Amsterdam," entered into negotiations to establish a Latin-American Federation—Federación Obrera Ibero Americana—with headquarters in Buenos Aires.

Thus, the developments in the international labor movement during 1928 marked a realignment of forces and the beginnings of a new balance of power.

BOOK TWO
THE OUTLOOK

CHAPTER XVI

THE COURSE OF "AMSTERDAM"

After ten years of turbulent post-war history, the international labor movement today presents a more complex picture than ever before. There is a multiplicity of international organizations duplicating one another and competing for the support of the worker.

In the separate countries, the forces of labor are even more divided than internationally. At least seven different types of trade unionism may be distinguished today on the basis of creed, social program, and policy. There is the socialistic or "free" type whose main features are a tendency to form industrial or amalgamated organizations, a reliance on collective agreements with employers, the use of the strike and of other militant weapons only as a last resort, emphasis on control over working conditions and wage rates, a demand for protective labor legislation and for social insurance, a desire for recognition as part of the legal and economic system, and co-operation with political labor or socialist parties for the achievement of these ends. This type originally developed in Central Europe, but since the war British and French trade unions have also tended to conform to it.

Distinct from this "free" type, is the neutral or non-partisan trade unionism of America which still adheres to the basic principles of pre-war days—wage consciousness, reliance primarily upon collective bargaining, and non-partisan politics. The syndicalist type also has changed but little since pre-war days, and the same may be said of Christian trade unionism:

On the other hand, the communist, fascist, and nationalistic trade unions are post-war developments. The communist trade unions, as evolved in Russia, stand midway between a voluntary and state institution. While membership in these organizations is voluntary and their function is to protect the interests of the workers, they are part of the economic and political system of Russia, influencing the formulation of economic policy, and supporting the institution of "proletarian dictatorship." Fascist trade unionism, combining the organic idea of the nation with syndicalistic elements, makes labor a constituent element of the "corporate state." The nationalist trade unions are regarded as a means of mobilizing workers for nationalist aims; such unions are found chiefly in Czechoslovakia, Germany, and Austria.

Of the fifty-odd countries in which there are industrial, political, or cultural labor associations,¹ only a few are free of rival organizations. In most coun-

¹ The total number of distinct countries in the world today is 68.

tries, labor is divided between two or three types of trade unionism, while in countries like Germany, Holland, Poland, or Czechoslovakia, there are from four to a dozen central labor bodies belonging to one or another of the types described.

Were the labor organizations of the separate countries not divided within themselves, they could be combined internationally in 20 to 25 associations, based upon a division of functions. There would be room for twenty-odd international trade secretariats combining workers in the same trades or industries in different countries. There would be place for a general international labor federation inclusive of the national centers of the separate countries; and there might be room for an international political labor association with auxiliary associations devoted to cultural and educational ends.

As it is, the international labor movement today is made up of over 70 organizations divided into five systems or "tendencies"—socialistic, non-partisan, communist, syndicalist, and Christian. The fascist and nationalistic unions are not combined internationally. Each of the five systems is a network of supplementary organizations based upon a division of labor between trade unions, political parties, cultural, and auxiliary associations.

What the international labor movement is today, what meaning it has, and what it is likely to be tomorrow, is determined by these organizations, by what they do and how they do it, by the effects

THE INTERNATIONAL

Tendency or Point of View	General Industrial Organizations	Trade Organizations
Socialistic or "Free"	International Federation of Trade Unions or "Amsterdam"	27 International Trade Secretariats
Non-Partisan ^a or Neutral	Pan-American Federation of Labor	—
Communist.....	Red International of Labor Unions	15 International Propaganda Committees
Syndicalist.....	International Workingmen's Association	Two International Trade Secretariats
Christian.....	International Federation of Christian Trade Unions	15 International Trade Secretariats

^a Attempts to form in Europe an International Association of Independent Trade Unions, said to be neutral in character, have been made repeatedly, but so far unsuccessfully.

LABOR MOVEMENT

Political Organizations	Auxiliary Organizations	Related Organizations
Labor and Socialist International	Socialist Youth International Lucerne Sports International etc.	International Labor Organization of the League of Nations International Cooperative Alliance
—	—	—
Communist or Third International	Young Communist International Red Sports International etc.	—
Anarchist Groups and Societies	International Anti-Militarist Commission etc.	—
No international Organization. In separate countries co-operate with Catholic and Christian political parties	No international organization. In separate countries have Workers' Leagues devoted to religious education of workers	International Labor Organization of the League of Nations

MEMBERSHIP OF INTERNATIONAL LABOR ORGANIZATIONS ^a

Tendency or Point of View	Jan. 1, 1928	Dec. 31, 1924 ^b	Dec. 31, 1921 ^b
TRADE UNION ORGANIZATIONS:			
The I. F. T. U. or "Amsterdam"	13,145,225	17,702,431	22,411,826
The R. I. L. U. or Communistic	12,000,000 ^c	7,333,845	7,069,000
Syndicalist	162,000	471,439	1,254,217
Christian	1,421,789	2,112,109	3,759,106
Pan-American Federation	—	—	—
Miscellaneous ^d	—	8,442,887	11,778,983
TOTAL	—	36,062,711	46,273,132
POLITICAL ORGANIZATIONS:			
Labor and Socialist International	6,637,622	—	—
Third International	1,707,769	1,222,035	—

^a This table is a summary of the data given in the tables in this and in following chapters.

^b The figures for 1921 and 1924 which were published by the International Federation of Trade Unions in 1926, represent not affiliations, but general acceptance of point of view. Thus, in the "Amsterdam" group for 1924 is included the membership of the American Federation of Labor and of the Mexican Federation of Labor.

^c See footnote on page 536.

^d This group includes unions which have no international affiliations and whose point of view it is hard to classify; for example, the trade unions of Australia, the Fascist unions, etc.

which their activities have on industrial and social life, and by the trends and forces which shape their destinies. To view the international labor movement dynamically, as it is and as it is becoming, it is necessary to visualize these several systems of international organizations in their distinctiveness and in their interrelations. That is the task of the eight chapters which follow, while the last chapter is reserved for a summary of general trends and for an interpretation of the movement.

I. OUTLOOK AND POLICY

"Amsterdam," or the International Federation of Trade Unions, is the international association of trade unions of the socialistic type. Despite its setback since 1921, it is still the largest and most coherent labor International today. It is the center of a system embracing national centers and international trade secretariats and allied with the Socialist International and with the International Labor Organization of the League of Nations. Its membership of over 13,000,000 men and women includes the great majority of the trade unionists of Europe, and some outside of Europe.

In its outlook, the Amsterdam International represents what may be called "reformist internationalism." It accepts the socialist ideal as the goal of social evolution. But since it regards the socialist transformation of society as a gradual and slow

process and considers a violent revolution neither inevitable nor desirable, it conceives its main task to be one of promoting economic and social reforms under capitalism.

In fact, the trend of "Amsterdam" is to merge the socialist ideal with the ideas of "workers' control" and of "industrial democracy." Both these concepts are still very vague, but their general meaning is that it is necessary for the workers to acquire an increasing influence in industry and in the formulation of economic policies, and that for these purposes special institutions must be evolved, such as shop committees, factory councils, industrial courts. An institution which is especially emphasized, and the embryo of which exists in Germany and France, is that of national economic councils, composed of representatives of employers, workers, and the public.

Social reform is an essential element in the internationalism of "Amsterdam," for it carries with it two implications. One is that the advance towards socialism within any one country is in large measure dependent on progress in the same direction in other countries. The other is that international ideals can be promoted only *pari passu* with the progressive reconstruction of economic and social relations between groups and classes in each nation.

From this as a base, "Amsterdam" builds its international ideal and its practical program. For the more or less distant future, this ideal may be de-

scribed as a world society composed of independent socialist nations which co-operate peacefully for the general improvement of mankind. For the calculable future, "Amsterdam" stresses economic co-operation, democracy, and peace. In world economics, it advocates financial stability, provisions for the international utilization of raw materials, and a maximum freedom of movement and of trade. It favors the present trend towards the "rationalization" of industry, on condition that it be carried out without deleterious effects on wages, working conditions, and the human dignity of the worker. It accepts the formation of international cartels or trusts, subject, however, to governmental and trade union control, and demands the establishment of an International Cartel Office under the League of Nations. In world politics, it co-operates with the League of Nations which it regards as the embryo of a democratic world federation; favors the idea of a United States of Europe, and is definitely pacifist, anxious to avert war by all means, including that of general strikes. In matters of labor, it stands for the Bern International Charter of Labor,² stressing especially the eight-hour day, the need for higher wages and salaries, and for raising standards of living throughout the world. It endorses the principle of freedom of immigration, and advocates special agreements between trade unions and between governments to make membership of

² See Chapter VIII, pp. 188-189.

immigrants in labor organizations compulsory, and to accord to foreign workers the same rights and benefits as native workers have in the matter of protective labor laws and of social insurance.

II. METHODS OF WORK

"Amsterdam's" activities for the advancement of this practical program and of its ideal come under six heads. They are educational, organizational, financial, militant, legislative, and political. For educational purposes, "Amsterdam" maintains an information bureau, issues a weekly news letter and a monthly magazine, and publishes special reports and books on trade union history and on current political and social problems.

In matters of organization, "Amsterdam's" work consists in promoting or supporting trade unions where they are weak, as for instance in the Balkans. Where immigration complicates the task of trade unions, as in the industrial frontier districts of France, Belgium, Italy, and Luxemburg, "Amsterdam" encourages the formation of special mixed committees to organize the foreign workers and to supervise their recruitment, their working conditions, wages, and housing. Where political tendencies hinder the development of trade unions, "Amsterdam" extends its aid for organizing purposes. Thus, at present, "Amsterdam" is lending financial support to the Italian Confederation of Labor which has removed its headquarters to Paris and which is

trying to maintain from there a "free" trade union movement in Italy.

"Amsterdam's" financial and militant activities deal with ways and means of promoting mutual aid in the economic struggles of the workers. Since 1919, "Amsterdam" has collected funds for strikers and for general relief in widely separated countries. The tendency now is for "Amsterdam" to delegate this function to the trade secretariats, limiting its own responsibilities only to the larger emergencies.³ In addition, "Amsterdam" is pledged to prevent international strike-breaking and to apply an embargo to countries where big strikes are in progress, on condition that the workers of those countries do everything in their own power to stop the import and export of specified goods to and from their respective countries.

"Amsterdam" attaches great importance to the promotion of social legislation—of protective labor laws, of laws extending the rights and powers of trade unions, and of social insurance. It is with this in view that it takes an active part in the International Labor Organization of the League of Nations.⁴ It supports the work of the I. L. O. by waging international campaigns to hasten the ratification of the Conventions drafted by the I. L. O. Thus, on May 1, 1928, the national centers of "Amsterdam" in all

³ See Chapter XIV, p. 364. For statistics of relief actions see Appendix.

⁴ For the manner of this co-operation see Chapter XIX.

countries were called upon to stage a simultaneous demonstration in favor of ratifying the Washington Convention on the Eight-Hour Day.

In working for its legislative program, "Amsterdam" treads upon the precincts of politics. It becomes entirely political in character, when concerned with general economic and political objectives. In pursuance of these, it takes a stand on all the great issues of international life such as reparations, the occupation of the Ruhr, disarmament, world debt settlements, international commercial treaties. The general method of "Amsterdam" is to demand special representation at all official gatherings dealing with world problems and on official international commissions or committees. It was represented at the International Economic Conference called under the auspices of the League of Nations in May 1927. Its delegates sit on the three commissions on trade, industry, and agriculture, created by that Conference. It addresses memorials, manifestoes, and communications to the Secretariat of the League of Nations, to the Assembly of the League, and to the Supreme Council, urging its views, voicing protestations, or making demands. To bolster these up, it calls upon its national centers to exercise their influence with their respective governments and to bring popular pressure to bear upon those in power.⁵

⁵ How "Amsterdam" co-operates in these political activities with the Socialist International is described in Chapter XVII.

III. ORGANIZATION AND DISCIPLINE

For the carrying on of these activities, "Amsterdam" has contrived the mechanisms which form its organization. Every three years a congress is held at which the delegates of the national trade union centers formulate general policies. Only one national center from each country may be affiliated with "Amsterdam" and send delegates to the congresses in proportion to membership. Voting at the congresses is by countries, each country being allotted a definite number of votes.

The application of policies is entrusted to a General Council, an Executive Committee, and a General Secretary. Under the rules adopted at Paris in 1927, each country affiliated with "Amsterdam" has a representative on the General Council. The latter is composed at present of 24 members.⁶

The Council meets once a year to map out the work for the year and to adopt a budget. The executive work is carried on by the Executive Committee. This committee is composed of seven members: the president, five vice-presidents, and the general secretary. The Executive Committee meets every two months and guides the activities of the Secretariat. The latter is administered by the general secretary with the aid of a permanent staff.

⁶ The number of countries affiliated with "Amsterdam" is 28; but Greece, Lithuania, Southwest Africa, and Argentina have not designated as yet their members on the Council.

In none of these bodies is representation provided for women. Yet women form part of the organized workers affiliated with "Amsterdam," and it is assumed that it is desirable to extend trade unionism among women workers. "Amsterdam" meets the situation by maintaining an International Committee of Trade Union Women and by arranging special International Conferences of Trade Union Women to consider questions of propaganda among women, to advise in matters of social legislation for women, and to furnish information on questions affecting women in industry.

As an international body, "Amsterdam" has but limited powers of discipline. It can exercise discretion in admitting national centers to membership, and it may expel any organization which fails to live up to decisions. As a matter of fact, "Amsterdam" is reluctant to exercise even its limited powers and relies more upon persuasion and upon compromise than upon coercion. While in theory "Amsterdam" requires all national centers to subscribe to its general principles, in practice it interprets this provision broadly, and allows its national centers autonomy in their internal affairs.

"Amsterdam's" effectiveness lies not in its powers of coercion, but in its capacity to influence the collective opinion of European labor and to mobilize the labor leaders of the different countries for common action. When necessary, the Amsterdam Secretariat, the Executive Committee, and the General

Council can be called together quickly. Communication by mail, by telegraph, and over the long distance telephone enables them to keep in touch in the intervals between meetings. The permanent staff and the chief officers visit the various countries as fraternal delegates to trade union congresses and on other occasions. Most of these men have influence with their governments or with the important opposition parties, and are familiar figures in the assemblies of the League of Nations, and in other official places.

In pursuing these tactics, "Amsterdam" proceeds on a modified conception of class relationships. True to socialist traditions, it assumes in a general way that there is a class struggle which shapes economic and political developments. Applied to international relations, this means that there is a basic solidarity between the workers of different countries, that the workers have a primary interest in the promotion of international ideals, and are especially fit because of their economic and social position to promote such ideals, especially the preservation of world peace.

But all these assumptions are limited by modifying clauses. Thus, "Amsterdam" regards the international solidarity of the workers less as a fact, than as a potentiality which is slow in developing and which is hindered by national, economic, racial and cultural differences. While it affirms the class struggle, it believes in working with employers for

definite economic and social ends. While it asserts the primacy of labor in world peace, it calls upon all the liberal and progressive elements to co-operate with labor. While it distrusts existing governments in their conduct of international affairs, it tries to run along with them as much of the way as possible. In other words, "Amsterdam's" tactics are those of international bargaining and compromise.

How important this can be is revealed by the record of the past ten years. The critics of "Amsterdam" claim that in these ten years "Amsterdam" has achieved nothing. But these very critics accuse "Amsterdam" of having prevented the workers of Europe from achieving a complete social revolution. Evidently, "Amsterdam" has been an important element in the restoration of peace and of economic stability in Europe. It is the recognition of this fact that has made the governments of Europe sensitive to the opinions and activities of "Amsterdam" and has led them to give it the place it now holds in the League of Nations.

IV. HURDLES IN THE PATH

"Amsterdam's" difficulties today arise chiefly from limited membership, from unfavorable external pressures, and from internal divisions. In membership it is not merely the drop of nearly 50 per cent since 1920, but also its narrow distribution which counts. Of the 13 million men and women

affiliated with "Amsterdam" and distributed in 28 countries, more than 12,500,000 are in 23 countries of Europe. Outside of Europe, "Amsterdam" has only five affiliations: the Trades and Labor Congress of Canada, the Confederación Obrera Argentina, the General Federation of Jewish Labor in Palestine, the Industrial and Commercial Workers' Union of South Africa,⁷ and a Workers' Organization in Southwest Africa.

"Amsterdam" is thus for all practical purposes a European organization. On further examination, however, it is seen that even in Europe there are gaps in "Amsterdam's" jurisdiction. Russia, Finland, Norway, Portugal, and Ireland are not members. Furthermore, in some countries, for instance in Italy, "Amsterdam's" membership is merely nominal; while in others, it represents but part of the organized workers of the country.


This condition limits "Amsterdam" in two ways. It means smaller financial resources.⁸ Amsterdam's budget in 1927 and 1928 was \$63,114 and \$65,928 respectively. Secondly, it weakens "Amsterdam" at those very points where its program is more and more being put to the test.

"Amsterdam's" efforts to extend its influence, or

⁷ This is an organization of native colored workers whom the white workers refuse to accept on account of their color.

⁸ From time to time, the weaker trade union centers have paid reduced rates, while some of the larger countries have fallen in arrears with their dues. For the statistics of dues paid to "Amsterdam" see Appendix.

RATE OF ORGANIZED WORKERS TO TOTAL POPULATION, BY COUNTRIES, DECEMBER 31, 1924¹
I. Throughout the World



Ratio, in percentages: ■ 8 to 17 ▨ 5 to 8 ▩ 3 to 5 ▧ 1 to 3 ▦ Under 1 □ No data available

¹ For detailed data see Appendix, p. 624.

II. In Europe



MEMBERSHIP OF THE INTERNATIONAL

Country and Organization Affiliated

TOTAL.....
Great Britain: The Trades Union Congress.....
France: Confédération Générale du Travail.....
Belgium: Commission Syndicale de Belgique.....
Luxemburg: Commission Syndicale.....
Spain: Unión General de Trabajadores de España.....
Italy: Confederazione Generale del Lavoro.....
Switzerland: Schweizerischer Gewerkschaftsbund.....
Germany: } Allgemeiner Deutscher Gewerkschaftsbund.....
} Allgemeiner Freier Angestelltenbund.....
Austria: Bund der freien Gewerkschaften.....
Czechoslovakia: Odborové Sdružení Československé.....
Hungary: Ungarländischer Gewerkschaftsrat.....
Holland: Nederlandisch Verbond van Vakverenigingen.....
Denmark: De Samvirkende Fagforbund i Danmark.....
Sweden: Landssekretariatet.....
Estonia: Eestimaa Töölisühingute Keskkliit.....
Latvia: Zentralbüro der Gewerkschaften.....
Lithuania: Darbininkų ir Tarnautojų Profesinių Sąjunga.....
Memel Territory: Gewerkschaftsbund des Memelgebietes.....
Poland: Związek Stowarzyszeń Zawodowych w Polsce.....
Rumania: Confederația Generală a Uniunilor Sindicale Muncitorești.....
Yugoslavia: Ujedinjeni Radnički Sindikalni Savez.....
Bulgaria: Allgemeiner Freier Gewerkschaftsbund.....
Greece: Confédération Générale du Travail.....
Palestine: General Federation of Jewish Labour.....
Union of South Africa: Industrial and Commercial Workers' Union.....
Southwest Africa: Arbeiter-Verband für Südwest-Afrika.....
Argentina: Confederación Obrera Argentina.....
Peru.....
Canada: The Trades and Labor Congress.....

^a The names of organizations are as of October, 1928. Some of the organizations have undergone change either in form or in name since 1921. The figures given here are those given in the Year Books of the I. F. T. U. for 1924-27.

^b Membership on July 1, 1921, was 23,907,059.

FEDERATION OF TRADE UNIONS ^a

Jan. 1, 1928	Dec. 31, 1925	Dec. 31, 1923	Dec. 31, 1921 ^b
13,145,225	13,366,387	15,316,127	21,991,615
3,874,842	4,365,619	4,328,235	6,559,933
605,250	605,250	757,847	756,243
530,575	552,094	594,998	698,384
14,179	13,398	12,100	20,966
221,000	235,007	210,617	240,113
—	234,520 ^c	234,520	1,200,000
165,692	149,997	151,401	225,822
4,415,689	4,182,511	5,749,763	7,776,728
394,801	399,855	543,596	640,472
772,762	807,515	896,763	1,079,777
542,637	356,386	324,179	827,761
127,422	125,024	176,401	152,577
202,696	189,686	179,929	223,718
156,425	239,704	233,116	242,545
437,974	384,617	313,022	313,208
5,071	— ^d	— ^d	— ^d
18,732	16,679	12,658	22,607
18,486	— ^d	— ^d	— ^d
1,024	1,401	1,907	—
271,581	224,423	369,811	365,190
26,783	33,093	33,246	—
33,217	27,156	34,837	50,000
2,485	14,803 ^c	14,803	14,803
—	— ^e	— ^e	170,000 ^e
21,873	18,663	10,736	—
60,660	— ^e	10,000	50,000
600	— ^d	— ^d	— ^d
82,574	82,574 ^f	— ^e	74,958
—	— ^d	— ^e	25,000
140,195	106,412	121,642	164,883

^c Nominal figure only.^d Not affiliated.^e Dropped out.^f As of February 1, 1926.

even to maintain itself within its present area, come up against several external obstacles. Fascism in its various forms accounts for the loss of "Amsterdam's" membership and for a weakening of its influence in Italy, Hungary, Lithuania, and elsewhere. Akin to political Fascism in its effects is what is known in Europe as "industrial Fascism." This refers to the conscious and systematic efforts which are now being made by employers in Europe, as well as in America, to detach the workers from trade unionism by means of special factory committees, workers' clubs, stock ownership, and similar devices.⁹

Another obstacle in "Amsterdam's" way are the activities of communists and syndicalists. Communist activities account for the splitting of the trade unions in France, Czechoslovakia, and in the Balkans. Leanings towards communist ideas keep the trade unions of Norway and Finland from joining "Amsterdam." Syndicalist preferences are the cause of the failure of "Amsterdam" to gain the adherence of the trade unions of Portugal or to make headway in Latin America.

V. PERSONALITIES AND LEADERSHIP

Internal conflicts within "Amsterdam" center in the struggle for leadership which is partly national in character and partly a matter of personalities. As described elsewhere, during the years of upheaval

⁹ This is similar in character to what American labor designates as "company unionism."

and confusion, from 1919 to 1923, "Amsterdam" was run by the two Dutch secretaries, Oudegeest and Fimmen, with the passive support of the French and Belgian leaders, Jouhaux and Mertens, and in spite of the British presidents, Appleton and Thomas. After 1924, both the German trade unions and the British Trade Union Congress became more active in the Amsterdam International. Theodor Leipart, the president of the German trade unions, became one of the vice-presidents of "Amsterdam," Sassenbach was made the German-speaking secretary, while A. A. Purcell became the president of "Amsterdam," and John W. Brown the English-speaking secretary. There was thus created a balance of power between three main groups—the English, the French and Belgians, and the Germans.

This balance was continuously in danger of being upset by the British ¹⁰ "Left wing"—Purcell, Hicks, and Brown. But though Purcell held the presidency of "Amsterdam," the British were a minority in the executive bodies, and "Amsterdam" was directed by the "Right wing" which was formed by the leaders of France, Belgium, Holland, and Germany; respectively Jouhaux, Mertens, Oudegeest, Leipart, and Sassenbach. Oudegeest was the spokesman of this "bloc," for, as a Dutchman, he bridged the post-war chasm between the labor movements of Germany and of the Allied countries.

Since the Paris Congress in August, 1927, the

¹⁰ For details, see Chapter XIII.

Germans have come forward as the chief claimants for "Amsterdam's" leadership. Again, as before the war, the German trade unions are leading the Amsterdam International in numbers, in organization, in finances, and in social-democratic consciousness. Again Germany is going ahead in the international arena. Industrially, she is becoming once more the most dynamic country of Europe. Politically, since her entry into the League of Nations, she is beginning to play an important part in world politics. On these grounds alone the German trade unions feel justified in claiming international leadership. But in addition, they are convinced that, despite the events of the war, they are cast for the part also psychologically and intellectually. They pride themselves on the fact that there persists among the German trade unions a sort of traditional internationalism. In corroboration, they point to the way in which the German trade unions continue to show interest in the labor movements of other countries, willingly subscribe funds during strikes in other countries, and invariably affiliate with international labor organizations. And they do not deny the fact that they have a vital interest in the policies of "Amsterdam" in view of the latter's potential influence in shaping public opinion on such issues as reparations, revision of the Dawes Plan, and disarmament.

On the other hand, the British trade unions are losing ground, are facing large and complex problems at home, and are but slowly overcoming their

formalism and traditionalism in working out new methods of action. More important still is the fact that the faith and interest of British labor in international action are waning. The British labor leaders are interpreting their experience during 1926-27 as evidence of the limited possibilities of internationalism to solve their problems. As a result, the British trade unions are now seeking a way out for themselves in new national policies, in the hope of increasing British efficacy in world markets by means of the reorganization of British industry with the aid of British employers. A psychologic factor in this trend is the persistent insular mentality of British trade unionists, their linguistic limitations, and their sense of superiority in representing the oldest trade union country in the world.

Germany's preponderance in "Amsterdam" would be inevitable, were it not for the fear of a "Germanization," similar to that of pre-war days. That, it is felt, must be avoided. It would alienate the British unions, while France and Belgium would resent it. Even the trade unions of such countries as Austria and Switzerland are opposed to it because of their fear that the West European trade unionists would be inclined to blame mistakes or failures on the Germans—and that would necessarily mean internal friction.

As a result, the trend in "Amsterdam" is towards a new equilibrium in which Germany and Great Britain will play the leading parts, while the balance

of power will be held by the French and Belgians on the one hand, and by the trade unions of Austria, Switzerland, Holland, and of the Scandinavian countries on the other. Such an equilibrium is assured by the arrangement which gives England the post of the presidency of "Amsterdam," places the administration in the hands of a German secretary, which allots the five vice-presidencies to France, Belgium, Germany, Czechoslovakia, and Denmark, and which maintains the headquarters in a neutral country.

VI. POWERS OF EXPANSION

Whether "Amsterdam" can become an all-embracing European organization depends on its relations with the trade unions of Russia. In general, the new situation within "Amsterdam" and the attitude of the new leadership does not promise an early reconciliation with "Moscow." With the break-up of the Anglo-Russian Committee, the main impulse back of the movement for such reconciliation has disappeared. In their present mood, the British trade unions are not inclined to resume the part of *advocatus diaboli*. On the other hand, the trade union leaders of Germany, France, and Belgium have a violent hatred of communism and communists. The West Europeans are tired of the presumptuous and vituperative methods which the Russians regard as an element of "open diplomacy," and are mistrustful of Russian good faith. It seems, therefore, that "Amsterdam" will await

developments which may settle the communist issue through a modification of the Russian regime or through a change in the policy of the Russian unions.

"Amsterdam's" desire to extend its influence in Asia, Africa, and Australia is dictated by several reasons. British labor is eager for closer contacts with the growing labor movements of India, Egypt, South Africa, and Australia. The Dutch are interested in labor conditions in the East Indies. All European labor organizations feel that it is necessary to combat communist influence outside of Europe as well as in Europe.

Even more cogent are the reasons which "Amsterdam" has for desiring the affiliation of the A. F. of L. It would mean greater financial and moral strength. It would bring within the fold of "Amsterdam" Mexico and other countries of Latin America. It would strengthen "Amsterdam's" lines against communist inroads. It would add greatly to "Amsterdam's" prestige and influence in the International Labor Office at Geneva. Especially eager for American affiliation are the German trade union leaders. The Germans believe that the American and German trade unions, though starting from different premises, are moving in the same direction. They see a basis for a German-American alliance within "Amsterdam" which would be decisive in matters of policy and tactics.

"Amsterdam," however, has to face serious diffi-

culties in its attempt to establish itself outside of Europe. The labor movements of Asia are as yet so unstable, so much involved in nationalistic movements, and so shot through with communistic influences that they cannot but regard "Amsterdam" as too European in outlook and interests. Australian labor is inclined to take a similar view, because of its position on the question of immigration and of its special interests in the Pacific. It refuses to join "Amsterdam," demanding the establishment of a united International. The American Federation of Labor is likely to waver for some time yet in its attitude towards "Amsterdam" because it has no longer a clear international policy of its own and is tending to follow the general lines of American foreign policy.

For the near future, therefore, "Amsterdam" is likely to remain a European organization with a few outlying affiliations in other parts of the world. In matters of policy, the tendency is towards a greater concentration on questions of wages and hours, on industrial and social legislation, on making the trade unions a part of the legal and economic system of the world. This means greater emphasis on peaceful propaganda and on the use of cautious methods which will not exhaust treasuries, disrupt organization, jeopardize prestige, or strain discipline. It also means a more vital interest in the work of the International Labor Office, and closer co-operation with the Socialist International.

CHAPTER XVII

"AMSTERDAM'S" SOCIALIST ALLIES

When the Labor and Socialist International was re-established in 1923¹ "Amsterdam" welcomed it and agreed to co-operate. At first intermittent, co-operation between the two Internationals has now become regular, extending also to the auxiliaries of the Socialist International; namely the Socialist Youth International and the International Workers' Association for Sports and Physical Culture, popularly known as the Lucerne Sports International.

These co-operative relations are an extension internationally of the ties which bind the trade unions and the socialist parties in most countries of Europe in a variety of forms. In some countries, the trade unions belonging to "Amsterdam" are affiliated directly and collectively with the labor or socialist party. Such is the case in Great Britain, Belgium, Norway, and Hungary. In Belgium, Denmark, Great Britain, Rumania, the trade unions and the political parties are represented on each other's executive committees. In Germany, no formal ties exist, but intimate relations between the

¹ See Chapter X, pp. 244-245.

trade unions and the socialist party are maintained through close personal contacts of the leaders and officials.

Few of the leaders of the Socialist International² would claim that there is today a clear-cut system of socialist internationalism. To the extent to which such an internationalism is in process of elaboration, it is emerging as a compromise between the three main tendencies which characterize the international socialist movement of today. In theory and in practical programs, these three tendencies are a continuation of the divisions which existed within the Second International before 1914, complicated by the effects of post-war splits and struggles.

I. SOCIALIST PROGRESSIVISM

Numerically and politically most important is the tendency designated as the "Right." It is dominant in the Social-Democratic Party of Germany, in the British Labor Party, in the socialist parties of Belgium, Holland, Sweden, Denmark, Czechoslovakia, Poland, Hungary, Spain, the Balkan States, and of the United States. These parties form the majority of the 36 parties affiliated with the Socialist International and the bulk of its membership of over six and a half millions.

There are many shadings of ideas within this tendency. Thus, the British Labor Party, or the

² The name Socialist International is used here for the sake of brevity.

French Socialist Party, though paying honor to Marx's memory, are guided in their political and social thinking by native influences. Also in Germany there are some socialists, sometimes referred to as the "Extreme Right," who would dispense with Marx and Marxism, arguing that Marx did not live to see the significant economic and social developments of modern times, and that little can be gotten from his writings upon the problems arising from these developments.

On the whole, however, the "Right," outside of England and France, continues to pay homage to Karl Marx. But the characteristic doctrines of Marxism³ have either been dropped or seriously modified. New theoretical elements have been introduced which emphasize the conscious factors in social life, the need and possibility of promoting the forces of production, the increasing influence of organized labor upon the state and in industry, and the need of co-operation between the workers and the middle class sections of the population for the purpose of progressively democratizing and socializing national institutions. All of which is a post-war development of pre-war Revisionism.

With the experience of Soviet Russia and of Fascist Italy before it, the "Right" is most emphatic in its declarations that socialism can and must be brought about only through peaceful and democratic methods. Political freedom, universal suffrage, par-

³ See Chapter III, p. 74.

THE LABOR AND SOCIALIST INTERNATIONAL: 1928 ^a

Country and Affiliated Party	Membership	Votes Received in Latest Elections	
		Number	As Percentage of Total Votes
TOTAL.....	6,637,622	25,568,209	...
Great Britain.....	{ British Labor Party ^b Independent Labor Party Social Democratic Federation..... Fabian Society..... Parti Ouvrier Belge ^b Socialist Party..... Socialist Labor Party..... Socialist Party..... Partito Socialista Unitario..... Socialist Party..... Social Democratic Party..... { German Social Democratic Labor Party..... Czechoslovakian Social Democratic Labor Party..... Czechoslovakian Social Democratic Labor Party..... German Social Democratic Labor Party..... Ruthenian Social Democratic Labor Party..... Polish Socialist Labor Party..... Social Democratic Party ^b Labor Party..... Social Democratic Labor Party..... Social Democratic Party.....	3,388,286 30,000 2,000 1,899 597,971 99,106 7,964 2,500 Party illegal 36,072 867,671 669,586 14,200 122,559 65,151 5,150 2,100 138,472 1,155 52,904 148,492	34 39.4 25 42.3 22.9 37.2
Belgium.....		820,650	...
France.....		1,692,960	...
Spain.....	
Portugal.....	
Italy.....	
Switzerland.....	
Germany.....		195,768	...
Austria.....		9,146,165	...
Czechoslovakia.....		1,539,635	...
Hungary.....		1,042,443	...
Luxemburg.....		126,854	...
Holland.....		706,704	...
Denmark.....		497,106	...

Sweden.....	Social Democratic Labor Party.....	202,338	725,844	40.9
Finland.....	Social Democratic Party.....	37,722	257,752	28.3
Estonia.....	Social Democratic Labor Party.....	4,500	119,914	22.9
Latvia.....	Social Democratic Labor Party.....	5,000	260,000	33.0
Lithuania.....	Socialist Party.....	2,000
Danzig.....	Socialist Party.....	5,418	61,588	...
Poland.....	{ Polish Socialist Party.....	55,000
	{ Independent Socialist Party.....	...	1,115,000	...
	{ German Socialist Party.....	8,406
Rumania.....	Social Democratic Party.....	13,000	49,752	...
Yugoslavia.....	Socialist Party.....	4,000
Bulgaria.....	Social Democratic Labor Party.....	30,126	60,000	...
Greece.....	Socialist Labor Party.....	2,800	7,800	...
Palestine.....	Poale Zion.....	22,500
China.....	Social Democratic Party.....	3,500
Argentina.....	Partido Socialista.....	10,000	90,000	...
British Guiana.....	Labour Union ^b	1,073
United States.....	Socialist Party.....	15,000
Other Countries ^c

^a The figures in this table are from the report submitted by the secretary to the third congress of the Labor and Socialist International.

^b Membership is collective by trade unions.

^c In addition, the Socialist International counts among its affiliations several illegal socialist groups and parties such as the Mensheviks and Social Revolutionists of Russia, Georgia, and the Ukraine; the socialists of Armenia; an emigrant group of Hungary, etc.

liamentary government, the rule of the majority, are vigorously defended as "working-class ideas" and as inseparable elements of socialism. Violence and force are either completely rejected or are admitted only as means of last resort, to be used exclusively in self-defense in case of an armed uprising of the capitalist class against a socialist government.

In this peaceful and democratic sense, the "Right" now thinks also of the "conquest of power," of class-struggle, and of the socialization of industry. The three processes are conceived as stages in a gradual transformation of capitalism into socialism. The capitalism of today, designated as the "New Capitalism" or "Super-Capitalism," is said to differ from pre-war capitalism in that it is "organized capitalism" and tends to proceed more and more on the basis of forward planning and of conscious co-ordination. Post-war capitalism thus is taking over the ideas of socialism and changing economic society in a socialist direction. The process, it is claimed is so rapid that its major results may be accomplished within the lifetime of the present generation.

As the "New Capitalism" proceeds in its work of transformation, it has to submit more and more to public control and to state regulation. Owing to the democratic nature of the state, the workers can exercise an increasing influence on this process. The class-struggle, therefore, tends to take on a wider political character, becoming more and more a struggle for the control of government. It tends

to become wider in a social sense, since in order to obtain greater political control, the workers must gain the support of the small farmers and of middle class elements of the population. The class-struggle tends also to become sublimated in form, relying more and more on intellectual and moral strength. Democracy and class-struggle thus become reconciled in the fact that only in a democratic environment can the workers build up industrial, political, and cultural institutions and develop the collective mentality which is a prerequisite for economic and social leadership.

In the course of time, the socialists cannot but win a majority of the people and obtain the power of the government. When that comes, a systematic socialization of economic life will become the order of the day. But also then, the "Right" visualizes the need of slow procedure, of nationalizing only such industries as can be nationalized more easily, and of making the change as painless as possible by compensating the owners of nationalized property either in toto or in part.

Even so conceived, the "conquest of power" remains merely a general goal about which but little need be said. What the "Right" has its eyes on as an immediate problem is the new condition in the principal countries of Europe in which the socialist parties are either the largest single parties or the major opposition parties. That means that they are called upon from time to time to form the gov-

ernment or to become partners in coalition governments. The "Right" demands that the socialist parties follow either course, according to conditions in different countries. Such coalition tactics are necessary, in the opinion of the "Right," in order that the socialists may carry out reforms for the workers, habituate the general population to socialist rule, and utilize economic developments for promoting the nationalization of the basic industries.⁴

II. AUSTRO-MARXISM

Different in emphasis as well as in some essentials is the second tendency of contemporary socialism designated as the "Center," or "Marxist Center." This tendency is represented chiefly by the Austrian Socialist party and for that reason is sometimes called "Austro-Marxism." Outside of Austria, it has the support of the socialist parties of Switzerland, Norway, of the United Socialists of Italy, of the German Socialist Party of Czechoslovakia, of the Independent Socialist Party of Poland, and of the Russian Social Democrats known as Mensheviks. Its adherents form opposition groups in the socialist parties in which the "Right" is in the majority.

What the "Center" starts out with is the assertion

⁴ Since 1918, socialists have taken part in coalition governments in Germany, Austria, Belgium, Czechoslovakia, Sweden, Denmark, Poland, Finland, Hungary, Bulgaria, Latvia. In France, the socialists have formed part of the government majority. The labor parties of England and of Norway have held power as "minority governments" with the support of other parties.

that the experience of the last 80 years since the "Communist Manifesto" was written has proved the correctness of the Marxian analysis of the historical process in general and of capitalistic development in particular. Consequently, the theoretical foundations of socialism today must remain untouched. Socialism must continue to assume that the expansion and concentration of capitalism is an economic necessity, that capitalism produces a numerically growing working class, that the misery and insecurity of the workers under capitalism result in a class struggle which becomes more and more acute and which must lead to a final social revolution.

In distinction to the "Right," the "Center" stresses the idea of class struggle, as the voluntaristic process through which automatic economic developments find conscious expression. The class struggle is carried on by the workers through the trade unions, the co-operatives, and the socialist party, resulting in a major class alignment with the workers on one side, the large and middle capitalists and landowners on the other. Between these two major social classes stands the lower middle class made up of small employers, farmers, traders, and professional people, who have the choice either of following the capitalist class or of allying themselves with the workers. As the industrial workers gain in power and prestige, the middle class elements rally to their support, and the workers become the advance-guard

of the whole people fighting against economic and political oppression.

Thus widened in scope, the class struggle becomes also wider in content. Besides being economic, it becomes cultural, a struggle between two class-ideals, namely, between a social system which makes physical and mental labor the servant of capital and bases the culture of the few on the vulgarity of the masses, and a social system which aims to place labor at the service of the nation and to give the whole people a share in the cultural heritage of mankind. The class struggle becomes also political in the largest sense of the term, that is, a struggle for the conquest of political power, because the people must use all the powers of the state to assure the triumph of their economic and cultural ends.

In its ideas on the "conquest of power," the "Center" differs markedly from the "Right." Though admitting that post-war capitalism has as yet considerable powers of development, the spokesmen of the "Center" think of socialism as an end attainable in the near future, and of the "conquest of power" by the socialists as the central socialist question of today. As they see it, the inner contradictions of capitalism, its incapacity to develop production fully and to raise living standards for everybody, must assert themselves within the calculable future and make a change towards socialism inevitable. But the "Right," according to the "Center," owing to its tactics, is in danger of being spiritually con-

quered by the capitalist environment and of being unprepared for revolutionary changes when the time comes. The "Center" aims to prevent this by holding up to the socialists the supreme task of a complete socialist transformation. While not rejecting entirely the policy of forming coalition governments, the "Center" urges caution in applying such policy and is more in favor of trying to form straight labor or socialist governments.

Like the "Right," however, the "Center" is for peaceful and legal methods. The leaders of the "Center" maintain that in most countries today any attempt to decide the struggle for the control of the government by force would mean civil war within the country and war with the outside world. Such a policy would mean bloodshed, economic disorganization which would hurt the workers for many decades, and possibly a terroristic dictatorship which would exercise irresponsible power over the workers. The "Center" believes that, despite all difficulties, the socialists have a chance to win the majority of the people as long as democratic institutions are maintained.

Once in control of the state, the socialist parties must prepare the way for the introduction of socialism. It was one of the large and basic views of Marx, say the spokesmen of the "Center," that capitalism could not pass into socialism directly, but that there must be a "transition period." The tasks of a socialist government during the "transition

period" will involve the confiscation of large landholding, of real estate in the cities, of mining resources, of the railways, of large manufacturing enterprises, of trade, banks, and insurance companies. Whether the owners of such properties will be compensated will depend on circumstances.⁵ But the property of the small trading classes, of small entrepreneurs, and of the farmers will be respected.⁶ Thus the "transition period" will have socialistic and capitalistic enterprises side by side, and it will be the policy of the government to encourage the former and the duty of the workers to help the government in this task by giving their best efforts and maximum proficiency.

Politically, the "transition period" means to a certain extent the domination of the working class. But that is not to be interpreted in the manner of the Bolshevist regime in Russia which, according to the "Center," never was and is not now a "dictatorship of the proletariat" in the Marxian sense of the term. Bolshevism has been and remains a terroristic dictatorship of a political party, exercised

⁵ If compensation is granted, it is proposed that the bonds issued for such purpose should be cancelled within the life-time of one generation.

⁶ The Austrian Socialist Party has adopted a special agrarian program which guarantees to the small farmer the undisturbed possession of his land in a socialist regime. Similar programs have been adopted by the socialist parties of those countries where the "Right" is in the majority. This is the culmination of a change in the agrarian policy of socialism which had begun before the war.

in the interests of a minority over the vast majority of the people. The "transition period," as conceived by the Austro-Marxians, must be accompanied by an extension of political and social rights, by a greater freedom of the press, and by wider intellectual and cultural opportunities.

III. SOCIALISM IN OUR TIME

Close to the "Center," but differing from it in some ways, is the third socialist tendency of the "Left." There are several variations of the "Left" in the different countries, where it consists of small groups which together with the "Center" form the opposition within the socialist parties. The strongest single party of the "Left" is the Independent Labor Party of Great Britain,⁷ whose doctrines and programs are the most coherent expression of this tendency in the international socialist movement.⁸

Like the Austrian "Center," the British "Left" thinks of socialism as a problem of practical politics and of the immediate future. Its slogan is "socialism in our time." Influenced by the post-war eco-

⁷ Some leaders of the Independents who play also a leading part in the Labor Party, are "Right" socialists; e.g. MacDonald and Henderson. Among those who have formulated the "left" doctrines is H. N. Brailsford.

⁸ There are some socialist groups in Europe which have much in common with the "Left," but which refuse to join the Socialist International, though they remain outside the Communist International. The most important of these are the Labor Party of Norway, the Maximalists of Italy, and the Jewish Bund in Poland. These groups maintain a Bureau in Paris which shows, however, few signs of life.

nomics of England, the "Left" insists that capitalism has broken down. Paraphrasing Marxian terminology of finance-capitalism, the British Independents say that under present-day conditions combination is taking the place of competition and that the banker controls industry, the "captains of industry" becoming more and more the mere "puppets of the bankers." Guided by motives of profit, the bankers fail to work out a rational credit policy which could give the proper direction to industry, control the business cycle, stabilize prices, and raise the efficiency and the standards of living of all the people. In political life, the "new capitalism" makes democracy no longer a fact or a possibility, and in large regions of daily life freedom exists only for the few who direct the state and industry on behalf of the small group of owners.

In the place of capitalism, the British "Left" would build a complete socialistic society. Following in the footsteps of Sidney Webb and of others, the Independent Labor Party has sketched a plan of the economic and social institutions of the coming socialism. Their scheme of a socialist state provides for a National Industrial Commission to carry on a plan-economy, a National Banking Board for the control of currency, finance and banking, and a number of institutions to secure industrial and political self-government.

However, "socialism in our time," means not an immediate realization of this ideal, but a decisive

move in its direction. Like the "Center," the "Left" visualizes a period of "transition" during which the foundations of socialism are laid. Practically, the "Left" demands that labor governments in Europe, but especially in England, upon coming into power, make a "frontal attack" upon poverty, as the first step towards socialism. The entering wedge for such an attack is the provision of a "living wage" which would assure all the workers a decent standard of living compatible with modern civilization and with the ability of industry to pay. Besides gratifying the ethical sentiment, such a wage would do away with under-consumption and would increase general purchasing power. Combined with a rational credit policy, it would prevent excessive savings, allowing a larger proportion of the national product for mass consumption, and thus making possible the development of the home market, of mass production, and of increased prosperity.

Bound up with the "living wage" is the policy of nationalization. The "Left" has no unbounded faith in the virtues and possibilities of nationalization. In those industries which are either bankrupt or in a state of inefficiency, nationalization would be fatal. What is needed in such cases as well as throughout industry generally, is "rationalization." But the key industries such as coal, power, transportation, importation of the chief raw materials and food, and also trade and banking, must be nationalized, in order to stabilize the price level, to

eliminate the middleman, and to control the business cycle.

It is the belief of the "Left" that this program can be carried out by parliamentary means, and that violent revolution is a doctrine of the middle nineteenth century which is no longer justified. In England, especially, an interruption of the normal processes of credit and foreign trade even for a few weeks, as a result of revolution, would starve the majority of the people even without a formal blockade. At the same time, the "Left" admits that there is no certainty of "gliding comfortably into socialism," and that the first socialist steps which a labor government may take will arouse bitter opposition. But the "Left" thinks that, under any conditions, it will be best to use Parliament as the means of enforcing the government's will, calling upon the workers in an extreme case to use the general strike to support the government.

In one respect, especially, the "Left" differs from the "Right" and the "Center," namely, in relation to Soviet Russia and to the communists. While the "Right" has but bitterness for the Bolsheviks, and while the "Center" does not believe in immediate reconciliation, the "Left" believes that a compromise between socialists and communists is possible. In this, the British "Left" has the support of "Left" groups in other countries which advocate socialist-communist co-operation.⁹

⁹ Especially in France.

IV. SOCIALISTS AND THE LEAGUE OF NATIONS

Disagreeing as they do in national politics, the three "tendencies" differ also on problems of international policy. To maintain the unity which was re-established with such difficulty in 1923, the Socialist International makes no attempt, therefore, to formulate at present a general doctrine of internationalism. It states its general ideal in the vague requirement that all political parties which affiliate with it should advocate the economic emancipation of the workers from capitalist domination and the establishment of a socialist commonwealth, and should accept in principle the class struggle as expressed in the independent political and industrial action of workers' organizations. Leaving aside sentimental and theoretical preoccupations, the Socialist International aims chiefly to develop a particular socialist policy within capitalism, on the general assumptions that democracy and social reform make for peace between nations, that national friction must be reduced slowly by a policy of give and take, and that a better world-spirit can be promoted by increasing socialist and labor influence in the institutions of international co-operation which already exist.

It is in this spirit that the solutions of the Socialist International for the main international issues of today are framed. Thus, in the reparations issue it demands that the total sum of payments be fixed

at an amount limited to material damages done. On the question of national self-determination, it advocates autonomy and equal cultural rights for national minorities in Europe, and the right of self-determination for the nations of Asia and Africa. While it is for complete disarmament in the future, its immediate program calls for measures limiting armaments and for compulsory arbitration. For the pacification of Europe, it urges the demilitarization and neutralization of certain frontier areas, the withdrawal of troops of occupation from Germany, and the revision of political frontiers by arbitration and plebiscite. While it condemns all "imperialist" intervention, it emphasizes the idea that the colonial countries can be prepared for economic independence and self-government only slowly and gradually.

In the center of socialist international policy stands the League of Nations. True, the socialists criticize the League of Nations in its present form. As they phrase it, before Germany's admission the League was a tool of Allied capitalism, now it is a tool of capitalism in general. None the less, the socialists believe that the League is the first effective international organ in history, the germ of the future juridical organization of the world, and a possible instrument for transforming the international "bourgeois state" of today into the International Socialist State of tomorrow.

With this in view, the Socialist International

advocates a gradual reform of the League, an extension of its economic powers, and a strengthening of the socialist and labor elements in it. Specifically, the socialist demands are that the League become a world democratic institution, embracing all nations without exception; that the Assembly of the League be made independent of the Council and be given wider powers of control; that representation in the Assembly be proportional and by parliaments instead of by governments. They would also have the League establish an International Economic Council, with participation of trade union and co-operative officials, to deal with monetary policy, production and consumption, facilities of communication, distribution of raw materials, the unification of economic legislation, and the liberalization of commercial policies.

V. AUTHORITY AND INFLUENCE

The working out of these policies is connected with the organization of the Socialist International. The supreme authority rests with the international congress which meets once in three years,¹⁰ but, in practice, policies are shaped by the executive organs of the International. These include an Executive Committee, an Administrative Committee, a Bureau, and a Secretariat. The Executive Committee is elected by the congress. At present it consists

¹⁰ Voting at these congresses is by majority, and each affiliated party has a number of votes in proportion to membership.

of some 40 members. Germany and Great Britain have three members each; the United States, Belgium, France, and a few other countries have two members each; other countries are allotted one member each, while some of the smaller East European countries are arranged in groups, each group getting one member only.

The Executive Committee meets four times a year. The Administrative Committee meets in the intervals and examines current questions. The Bureau of Nine is elected by the Executive Committee and is entrusted with the immediate direction of the International. To the Secretariat falls the administrative work of the organization. From 1923 to 1925 there were two secretaries, Tom Shaw of England, and Friedrich Adler of Austria. Headquarters were then in London. Since 1925, Friedrich Adler has been the only secretary and the headquarters have been in Zurich. The headquarters occupy five rooms in a private house in Zurich, and the staff consists of an assistant secretary and three translators. The annual income is about \$25,000,¹¹ and with these means, the Secretary publishes a bulletin called "Information" reporting the main events in the socialist movement of the different countries, and from time to time "Documents and Discussions," devoted to an examination by different

¹¹ During 1926 and 1927, the Socialist International received about \$41,054 in dues, exclusive of advances for 1928. Of this amount, about \$8,045 was paid by the British Labor Party, and about \$7,540 by the Socialist Party of Germany.

socialist writers of the main problems of socialist policy and tactics.

Leadership in the Socialist International is determined not only by the relative strength of the three "tendencies," but by national and personal factors. Thus, from 1923 to 1925, the Socialist International was largely under the influence of the British Labor Party. When headquarters were transferred from London to Zurich in 1925, the influence of the "Austrian Center" became greater, owing largely to the secretary, Friedrich Adler, and to the prestige of Otto Bauer, the leader of the Austrian Socialists. At present, the compromise between the three "tendencies" and the national differences in the International are expressed in the fact that Arthur Henderson, of the British Labor Party, is chairman of the International, Friedrich Adler, of the Austrian "Center," is secretary, while such leaders of the "Right" as De Brouckère of Belgium or Hermann Mueller and Otto Wels of Germany exercise influence in the executive committee.

Though its rules make decisions binding, the Socialist International has no powers of discipline. Its most effective work is done through personal contacts between the socialist leaders of the separate countries. During every emergency that has arisen in the last few years, during the Albanian crisis, the Polish-Lithuanian conflict over Vilna, Locarno, or Thoiry, the secretary of the Socialist International has called special conferences of social-

ist parties of the states involved to consider the most suitable policy for the socialists to pursue. Under the guidance of the International, German, Belgian, French, and British socialists have met repeatedly to talk over problems of reparations and security in order to bring about an understanding and a common policy. The International also watches over the socialists who represent their respective countries in the League of Nations.

The possibilities of influence which the Socialist International has at the present time derive from the new position of socialism in European politics. Socialism is no longer a mere movement of passive opposition, but an active factor in the governments of Europe. Socialists play an official part in the League of Nations, as delegates to the Assembly or as members of the Council. In such capacity and as members of the governments of their respective countries, they have a share in shaping international affairs.¹²

VI. PULLS AND STRAINS

In its current activities, the Socialist International is shaped by three main trends. One is the increas-

¹² Thus, the Belgian socialists, Vandervelde and De Brouckère, the Swedish socialist leader, R. J. Sandler, and socialists of other countries have been delegates to the Council of the League of Nations. Paul Boncour, the French socialist, was until recently an influential member of the Commission on Disarmament. Among the delegates to the sessions of the Assembly of the League there have been socialists from France, Belgium, Germany, Denmark, Sweden, Finland, Latvia, Esthonia, and Poland.

ing national outlook of the socialist parties in the different countries, which was aroused by the war, and accentuated by the Versailles Treaty and by the post-war debacle. In those countries which were most in the throes of post-war reconstruction, the socialists found themselves entrusted with the problem of maintaining the elementary conditions of national life or of building up a new national life. Throughout Central and Eastern Europe the socialists had to act in a way as receivers in bankruptcy, make peace, establish new political forms, save the national currency from collapse, protect violated frontiers. In Western Europe, they actively helped to solve national tasks of a similar character.

This trend is bound to continue. For as the socialists participate in coalition governments or form minority governments, they must try to balance and harmonize group interests in a larger national point of view. Appealing, as they do, to all classes of the population for support, the socialists, regardless of tendency, show an increasing sensitiveness to and concern for national interests and national ways of thinking, tending to become people's parties instead of class parties.

A second trend bears on economics. Socialist internationalism is distinctive in that it looks forward to the building up of a socialized world economy. But as socialists in separate countries become more concerned with and responsible for economic welfare and stability, they become more circumspect

with regard to sweeping economic reorganizations. The "Right" socialists face this situation frankly. The "Center," while talking of socialization, emphasizes the impossibility of carrying out a program of socialist reorganization in any one country. The British "Left," while seemingly more insistent on a program of "Socialism in Our Time," tends to regard such a program as a lever of propaganda rather than as a practical proposal. It is because of this that nationalization or socialization tends to be overshadowed by policies of economic and social reform.

A third trend is the Europeanization of socialism. Before the war the Second International, though largely European in character, had important outposts in the United States, in South America, and in Australia, and was animated by a hopeful expectation of world expansion. At present, the Socialist International is practically entirely European. The socialist groups in Armenia, China, and Turkey exist nominally only, while the socialist parties of the United States and Argentina, with 15,000 and 10,000 members respectively, are of little active significance in the International. As a result of this and of the big problems thrust upon Europe by the war, the Socialist International has been almost entirely absorbed in European affairs.

At present, events in China, India, Northern Africa are forcing the Socialist International to turn its eyes beyond the limits of Europe. It is

taking up the questions of colonialism, emigration, and capital exports.¹³ But these issues show that the Socialist International is more European in point of view than otherwise. In accordance with their general principles, the socialists hail the struggle of the peoples of Asia and Africa for political and economic self-determination. In their view, however, the emancipation of the colonial nations is merely the first step towards the development of new flourishing national capitalisms. Whatever that may mean in the distant future as part of a world process, for the near future it means sharper competition for European industrialism and a threat to established imperial institutions.

As this affects the different countries of Europe differently, the socialists find themselves divided on the issues involved. The socialists of the Scandinavian countries, of Austria, Czechoslovakia, and of several other countries are inclined to stress the need of a strict "anti-imperialist" policy. But the Labor Party of England, and the socialists of France, Holland, and Belgium, are against policies which would seriously disturb the basic relations of their home countries with their colonial dependencies.¹⁴

¹³ These were the main topics of discussion at the third congress of the Socialist International, held in Brussels, from August 5 to 11, 1928.

¹⁴ This conflict has come to the fore on several occasions. During the Riff War, the Socialist International ruled that everything should be done to settle the issue amicably and called for admission of the Riff State as an independent member of the League of Nations. But the French Socialist Party, supporting

A similar division exists on the issue of disarmament. To avoid serious conflict of opinion, the Socialist International is thus forced to center on European politics and to relegate colonial issues to the League of Nations in the hope of finding a slow solution through the processes of diplomacy.

VII. THE NATURE OF THE ALLIANCE

In view of their agreement in essentials, the Socialist International and "Amsterdam" find co-operation possible and desirable. To the Socialist International, "Amsterdam" brings the backing of millions of organized workers and the support of the trade unions. In return, the Socialist International backs up "Amsterdam" in the League of Nations, and in the various national parliaments.

Co-operation is effected in a practical way. When political matters or large economic and social issues are under consideration, the executive committees of "Amsterdam" and of the Socialist International hold joint meetings for the purpose. Specific demands are worked out in common and manifestoes are issued jointly. From time to time larger conferences of a special nature are arranged jointly.

the Herriot government, could not put into effect the decision of the International. Similarly, the Socialist International has called for the admission of Egypt to the League of Nations. But the action of the MacDonald Labor government in 1924, and the attitude of the British Labor Party since, towards the problems of Egypt and India, are at variance with the platform of the International. Like conflicts are evident in the position of the Dutch Socialists towards the problem of the Dutch East Indies.

The Bureaus and the secretaries of the two Internationals also meet to plan common action on decisions taken. In short, the relationship is that of allies in a common cause, and does not necessitate complete agreement on all points.

In the co-operative relationship, "Amsterdam" has played and still plays a leading part.¹⁵ The Socialist International has neither the organic unity nor the necessary capacity for action to claim leadership. The congresses of the Socialist International have not as yet regained their former prestige or moral influence. The sessions of the executive committees and the activities of the Socialist Bureau are very modest in character and attract but little outside attention. On the other hand, regardless of its weakened condition, "Amsterdam" still has a large membership, a solid trade union basis, and considerable resources for coherent action.

There are signs of a trend towards a modification of the present relations. As the socialists gain in political influence, they are inclined to reassert their claim to superiority over the trade unions. In England and Germany especially, there is a growing tendency on the part of the socialist and labor parties to claim that all economic problems are becoming more and more political in character, and that political action is tending again to become more important than trade union methods. On the other hand, the recent failures of large industrial action,

¹⁵ How this differs from pre-war days, see Chapter IV, p. 104.

and the growing economic and legal difficulties with which the trade unions are beset, are tending to swing trade union opinion in the same direction and to make trade unionists willing to turn more readily to political parties.

The trend is thus towards a division of labor between "Amsterdam" and the Socialist International as between equals. This trend is bound to be more rapid with the growing influence of the Germans in the two Internationals.

VIII. THE YOUTH INTERNATIONALS

Auxiliary in character is the co-operation between "Amsterdam" and the two Youth Internationals. In form of organization, the latter are entirely independent, having their separate congresses, executive organs, finances, etc. But in essence, they are auxiliary to the Socialist International whose guidance they accept. In fact, the two Internationals are but the international federations of the young workers' societies, sport clubs, nature friends, hiking clubs, self-education clubs, which form a part of the socialist movement in the various countries of Europe and which are especially developed in Germany, Austria, Holland, Belgium, and in the Scandinavian countries.¹⁶

¹⁶ There are several other international organizations which are supplementary to the Socialist International. Such are the International Federation of Socialist Students; the Workers' International of Total Abstainers; and the International Conference of Labor Samaritans whose function is to be a sort of Workers'

From the point of view of "Amsterdam," co-operation with the Youth Internationals is important in several ways. It is a means of attracting young workers into the trade union organizations. It enables "Amsterdam" to speak more authoritatively for protective labor laws for young workers in the International Labor Office. It is valuable in connection with the educational work of "Amsterdam." Both Youth Internationals lay emphasis on the physical and mental development of the young worker. The Sports International views sports and physical education not only as entertainment, but as a means of promoting a social spirit among the workers, as opposed to the competitive ideals of today. The Youth International is guided by the idea of "creating a socialist man," free from the influence of capitalist culture and capitalist environment. They thus supplement "Amsterdam" in its efforts towards the building up of an international point of view. The "International Youth Days," which the Youth Internationals arrange, the "workers' Olympiads,"¹⁷ the sport events which bring workers of different countries together, the tours which take workers from one country to

Red Cross. Workers' militia and workers' defense corps also exist in Germany, Austria, Belgium, and in several other countries for the purpose of defending democratic institutions and the workers' rights.

¹⁷ An illustration of these is the Olympiad held in Prague in July, 1927. About 70,000 young socialists from various sections of the Lucerne Sports International took part and more than 100,000 people witnessed their exploits from day to day.

another, and various other enterprises help to promote a greater acquaintance between workers of different countries and are an important factor in creating among the workers a general European spirit.

Of especial importance is the reliance of "Amsterdam" on the Youth and Sports Internationals for promoting its peace propaganda. The Youth International pledges itself to carry on with all the means at its disposal the fight against war and militarism. In the separate countries, its affiliated branches deal with the question in practical ways. In Norway, for instance, young socialists urge their members to refuse compulsory military service and to accept alternative service under a civil authority. In England, the Guild of Youth is for resistance to war by refusing compulsory military training or the handling of munitions either in time of peace or in time of war.

Whatever strength the Youth Internationals add to "Amsterdam" is limited by the difficulties which these Internationals themselves have to face. Owing to the nature of their ideas and their methods, the Youth Internationals attract the more cultivated and economically better paid elements of the working youth. They fail to reach the general mass of workers. On the other hand, the young workers who profit by these associations become primarily interested in cultural matters and in self-education and tend to lose interest in politics and in trade

unionism. Besides, there is the competition of nationalist, religious, and communist organizations. In general, the Youth Internationals are strongest in Germany, Austria, Belgium, Holland, and in the Scandinavian countries. Their work thus tends to increase the influence of the Germanic-speaking countries in the Socialist International and in "Amsterdam."

CHAPTER XVIII

THE PLACE OF THE TRADE SECRETARIATS

An integral part of the "Amsterdam" system are the 27 International Trade Secretariats whose headquarters are in 12 different cities in seven countries of Europe. These Trade Secretariats include not only industrial workers, but agricultural laborers, clerical and office workers, public service and government employees.

Their place in the "Amsterdam" system is based on an agreed division of functions. "Amsterdam," or the I. F. T. U., is the spokesman of the general international interests of labor, while the function of the Trade Secretariats is to protect the particular interests of their respective trades or industries. The secretariats are entirely independent in their internal affairs; but they obligate themselves in matters affecting other trades or the I. F. T. U. as a whole, to consult "Amsterdam" and to carry out the general policies of "Amsterdam." To co-ordinate activities, an annual conference between the Amsterdam General Council and the Trade Secretariats is provided for, and officials of the latter may also attend the sessions of the Executive Committee and the congresses of "Amsterdam," in a consultative capacity.

I. STRUCTURE AND MEMBERSHIP

The 27 secretariats differ in structure, size, finances, and other ways. Since 1919, the tendency has been to form large industrial secretariats.¹ The chief reasons for this are the formation of industrial unions in the various countries of Europe and the belief that the international secretariats could be more effective when supported by a larger membership.

Nevertheless, there are still ten secretariats on a craft or narrow trade basis,² namely the secretariats of the painters, stone workers, diamond workers, hatters, printers, lithographers, bookbinders, glass workers, pottery workers, and barbers. Partly owing to that fact, partly as a result of differences in technical processes and in trade union structure

¹ In 1920, the three secretariats of bakery workers, brewers and millers, and butchers joined to form the International Union of Federations of Workers in the Food and Drink Trades. In 1921, the three secretariats of boot and shoe workers, hide and leather workers, and saddlers, combined into the International Federation of Boot and Shoe Operatives and Leather Workers. In January, 1925, the secretariat of carpenters was absorbed by the International Union of Building Workers; and the Furriers' Secretariat became part of the International Clothing Workers' Federation.

² These could amalgamate as follows: the painters and stone workers with the International Union of Building Workers; the hatters with the International Clothing Workers' Federation; the printers, lithographers and bookbinders might unite into one printing trades secretariat; the glass workers, pottery workers, and general factory workers could form one organization; while the tobacco workers and the diamond workers might find a place respectively in the Secretariat of the Food and Drink Trades and in the Metal Workers' Secretariat.

THE INTERNATIONAL TRADE SECRETARIATS

Industry	Name of Organization	Headquarters	Date of Reorganization After War
Agriculture	International Landworkers' Federation ...	Berlin	1920
Mining and Quarrying	Miners' International Federation	Brussels	1920
Lumber and Woodworking	International Union of Woodworkers	Amsterdam	1919
Building Trades	{ International Union of Building Workers.. International Secretariat of Painters and Kindred Trades	Hamburg	1919
	{ International Secretariat of Stone Workers.	Hamburg Zurich	1920 1921
Metal, Machinery, Shipbuilding	{ International Metal Workers' Federation.. Universal Alliance of Diamond Workers...	Bern Antwerp	1920 ...
Textile, Leather, Clothing	{ International Federation of Boot and Shoe Operatives and Leather Workers	Nuremburg	1921
	{ International Clothing Workers' Federation International Federation of Hatters	Amsterdam Altenburg	1920 1921
	{ International Federation of Textile Workers' Associations	London	1921
Food, Drink, and Tobacco	{ International Union of Federations of Workers in Food and Drink Trades	Zurich	1920
	{ International Secretariat of Tobacco Workers	Amsterdam	1919

Printing Trades.....	{ International Typographical Secretariat... International Federation of Lithographers and Kindred Trades..... International Federation of Bookbinders and Kindred Trades.....	Bern Brussels Bern Paris Berlin Amsterdam Amsterdam Vienna Amsterdam Berlin Berlin Amsterdam Amsterdam	1921 1920 1920 1921 1919 1920 1919 1921 1920 1920 1920 1920 1927
Clay, Stone, Glass.....	{ International Federation of Glass Workers. International Federation of Pottery Workers International Federation of General Fac- tory Workers.....	Amsterdam	...
Transportation and Communication..	{ International Transport Workers' Federa- tion..... International Union of Post, Telegraph, and Telephone Workers.....	Amsterdam Vienna	1919 1920
Public Service.....	International Federation of Employees in Public Services.....	Amsterdam	1919
Personal Service.....	{ International Union of Hairdressers..... International Union of Hotel, Restaurant, and Bar Workers.....	Berlin Berlin	1921 1920
All Other.....	{ International Federation of Commercial, Clerical, and Technical Employees..... International Teachers' Federation.....	Amsterdam Amsterdam	1920 1927

in different countries, there is much jurisdictional overlapping between the secretariats. On the other hand, the larger secretariats find that there is an "upper limit" to amalgamation, a sort of law of diminishing returns. For, as the number of trades brought together increases, the field of interests which the workers in such trades share in common becomes narrower and the capacity for common action becomes weaker. To meet this problem, these larger secretariats provide for special craft and trade sections.³

Membership ranges from 9,160 for the Barbers' Secretariat to 2,224,000 for the Transport Workers' Federation. As a rule, the craft secretariats have a smaller membership. But aside from form of organization, the size of a secretariat is affected by the nature of the industry, its extent, the degree of trade union organization in separate countries, and the number of affiliations which have been secured in different countries.

Some of the craft secretariats have the lowest number of national affiliations. There is no cor-

³ Thus, the International Transport Workers' Federation has separate sections of railwaymen, seamen, dockers, motor drivers, train car men, and inland navigation; the International Federation of Commercial, Clerical, and Technical Employees has sections of bank clerks, commercial travelers and others; in the Secretariat of Workers in the Food and Drink Trades there is a section of bakery workers. Special conferences of such sections are held to consider their craft problems, and efforts are made in the general work of the secretariats to satisfy their particular needs.

THE INTERNATIONAL TRADE SECRETARIATS ^a

Name of Organization	Membership on Jan. 1, 1927	Number of Countries in Which Secretariat Had Affiliations on January 1, 1926			
		Total	Eu- rope	Amer- ica	Asia
International Landworkers' Fed...	314,666	14	14	—	—
Miners' International Federation...	1,878,706	15	14	1	—
International Union of Woodworkers	999,668	22	18	3	—
Inter. Union of Bldg. Workers.....	761,606	21	19	1	1
International Secretariat of Painters and Kindred Trades.....	181,375	11	10	1	—
Inter. Secretariat of Stone Workers.	103,944	12	12	—	—
International Metal Workers' Fed.	1,582,932	19	18	1	—
Univ. Alliance of Diamond Workers	22,696	7	6	1	—
International Fed. of Boot and Shoe Operatives and Leather Workers.	283,399	16	15	1	—
Inter. Clothing Workers' Fed.....	306,877	18	17	1	—
International Federation of Hatters	48,576	13	11	2	—
Inter. Fed. of Textile Workers.....	941,551	12	11	1	—
International Union of Fed. of Workers in Food and Drink Trades	745,001	18	17	1	—
Int. Sec. of Tobacco Workers.....	106,418	11	11	—	—
Inter. Typographical Secretariat...	180,467	22	22	—	—
International Federation of Lithog- raphers and Kindred Trades....	46,081	21	20	1	—
International Federation of Book- binders and Kindred Trades....	79,509	15	15	—	—
Inter. Federation of Glass Workers.	94,827	9	9	—	—
Inter. Fed. of Pottery Workers....	119,457	6	6	—	—
International Federation of General Factory Workers.....	562,136	12	12	—	—
Inter. Transport Workers' Fed....	2,224,954	35	30	2	3
International Union of Post, Tele- graph, and Telephone Workers	475,304	19	17	1	1
International Federation of Em- ployees in Public Services.....	498,673	14	14	—	—
International Union of Hairdressers	9,169	9	9	—	—
International Union of Hotel, Restaurant and Bar Workers....	62,683	15	15	—	—
International Federation of Com- mercial, Clerical, and Technical Employees.....	691,387	18	18	—	—
TOTAL.....	13,322,062				

^a The figures for this table are from the *International Trade Union Movement* for December, 1927.

relation, however, between the size or form of a secretariat and the number of its affiliations, because the latter depends to a large extent on the geography of the industry. Neither does the number of affiliated organizations necessarily correspond to the number of affiliated countries. Most of the secretariats have more than one organization in each country, and the number of organizations increases with the heterogeneity and size of the secretariats.

Because of ups and downs in affiliated trade unions, the membership of the different secretariats is in constant flux, and it is not always possible to fix the relative place of the secretariats in membership. The transport workers and metal workers have several times changed places at the head of the list during the last few years, and other secretariats have alternately moved ahead or fallen back. The three largest secretariats are those of the transport workers, metal workers, and miners; their combined membership forms about 45 per cent of the total membership of the secretariats.

II. COMMITTEES AND SECRETARIES

As working organizations, the 27 secretariats have arrangements which differ only in detail. All the secretariats collect dues directly from their affiliated trade unions. In some secretariats every two years, in others every three years, and only in a few at special call, an international congress is held to which every affiliated organization sends delegates.

In all the secretariats, the number of votes, and in some the number of delegates, is allotted in proportion to membership. The congresses of the small craft secretariats are small affairs. The congress of the Hairdressers' Secretariat in 1924 was attended by nine delegates; that of the hatters in 1925 by eleven delegates, and of the painters in 1925 by thirteen delegates. For the other secretariats, the number of delegates ranges from 20 to 125; the largest number of delegates being brought together by the metal workers, transport workers, and miners.

For all the secretariats, the congress is the supreme legislative body. It enacts statutes and by-laws, fixes the amount of dues, lays down rules for the admission and expulsion of members, adopts policies, and elects the secretary and the various standing committees. The congresses of most secretariats last two or three days, and only in a few cases are they planned for as long as a week.

In the interval between congresses, the powers of carrying out decisions and of administering the affairs of a secretariat are invested in committees and in the secretary. As a rule, the secretariats have two committees for the purpose, a larger one and a smaller one. The larger committee is known under different names, such as general executive committee, representation committee, international bureau, general council, or central committee. In most secretariats it consists of five members, but in some it has six, seven or more. The Building Trades

Workers' Secretariat provides that each affiliated country should have a member on this committee; so does the Miners' Federation. The Metal Workers' Secretariat and the Transport Workers' Federation arrange the countries of the world into groups and allow one delegate for each group on the committee. This larger committee meets once in six months or, at least, once a year.

The smaller committee is generally known as the management committee. Usually, it is composed of the international secretary and of two or three officials of the trade unions of the country or city in which the secretariat has its headquarters. The management committee meets more frequently, supervises the work of the secretary, and advises with him, one of the committee acting as treasurer.⁴

Most of the administrative tasks fall to the international secretary. A large part of his duties are of a routine character, such as reading the mail, answering inquiries, collecting dues, keeping the accounts, preparing reports for the executive committees, and arranging the congresses. But most secretariats provide also for wider activities, such as making statistical inquiries, publishing a journal, maintaining personal contacts, attending confer-

⁴ The smaller management committee is not truly representative in character, but its organization is dictated by considerations of cost and convenience. Large executive committees composed of men who hold responsible positions in their own country cannot be called together as often as might be desirable, and their meetings are costly.

ences of affiliated organizations. The secretariats have budgets varying from a few thousand to over forty thousand dollars a year, and differ greatly in the size of their staffs and in the general organization of their headquarters. At present, the most highly developed secretariat is that of the International Transport Workers' Federation whose annual budget is about \$45,000. It has its own four-story house in the city of Amsterdam in which a staff of 14 translators, investigators, and clerks is employed. Two secretaries devote their entire time to the work of the Federation. Besides the transport workers, five other secretariats employ full-time secretaries. Their offices, however, are small and their staff consists of one or two clerks. The other secretaries are on a part time basis.

III. THEORIES AND ASSUMPTIONS

It is a necessary implication of their relations that the Trade Secretariats should accept "Amsterdam's" doctrine and general program. With but minor deviations, they do. Most of the secretariats proclaim in their constitutions their condemnation of war and "imperialism," their opposition to capitalism, their devotion to the ideals of industrial democracy and of the socialization of industry. Where such articles of faith are not put into the constitution, they are affirmed in resolutions at congresses or in some other way.⁵ "Amsterdam's" activities on

⁵ It is a common practice of the secretariats to close their congresses with the singing of the "International."

behalf of the eight-hour day, of peace, and of economic reconstruction are supported by the secretariats. The three secretariats of the transport workers, metal workers, and miners formed until recently the anti-war committee of "Amsterdam."

But the secretariats are concerned with these general programs and ideas only secondarily. Their primary purpose is to advance the "economic and moral" interests of the workers, as expressed in terms of wages, hours of work, sanitation and safety, continuity of employment, and security. Because of this, they are not content with the general doctrines of "Amsterdam," but develop ideas which explain and justify their special work and which bear more directly on international trade unionism in the narrow sense of the term.

In essentials, their theory is an extension of the assumptions of national trade unionism.⁹ At the basis of the theory is the idea that international competition tends to have an injurious effect on labor. This tendency presumably works itself out in two ways. On the one hand, the growing ease of travel and communication increases the international mobility of labor and stimulates migration, thus tending to internationalize the labor market and to bring workers of different countries into direct personal competition for jobs. On the other

⁹ It cannot be said that the secretariats have a consistent theory of international trade unionism. What one finds in their current literature are the raw materials for such a theory.

hand, the products of different countries with different labor standards are sold in the same world markets, resulting in the pitting of the workers of one country against those of another indirectly.

It is contended that both processes, when left to themselves, are "exceedingly menacing to the working classes." "In the competitive battle for markets," reads a typical declaration, "that employer has the best chance who is able to get the cheapest raw materials, the best machines and workers. Very often, this battle is decided at the cost of the workers, the employers paying low wages and lengthening the working hours, especially where the trade unions are weak."⁷ In more general terms, the argument is that "in a society founded on the competition of individual countries and individual markets, it naturally follows that the condition in the most progressive countries will be affected by the conditions prevailing in the more backward countries."⁸ With the industrialization of new countries such as China, Japan, or India, the tendency to depress the standards of the more advanced countries towards the level of the backward countries is accentuated.

While international competition threatens most seriously the workers, it tends to affect adversely industry as a whole through price-cutting, dumping,

⁷ Proceedings of the congress of the International Federation of Boot and Shoe Operatives and Leather Workers for 1925, p. 2.

⁸ Proceedings of the congress of the International Federation of Textile Workers' Associations for 1925, p. 16.

and in other ways. In many industries, therefore, competition is rapidly giving way to combination on an international scale. Large corporations and even individual employers reach out beyond national frontiers to open up factories and mills in order to profit by lower labor standards or to control the world supply of their products. More significant still is the formation of international cartels and trusts whose purpose is to combine resources and to regulate world production and prices. International combinations aggravate the situation, because, owing to their monopolistic powers and to their ability to allocate production and to close down plants at will, they can play the workers of one country against those of another for the purpose of leveling labor standards downward.

These adverse tendencies, whether of international competition or of international combination, are aggravated by the tactics of employers. "Every time the working class enters into battle in the individual countries in order to make an improvement in its position, it is at once met with the argument used by the capitalists of the country concerned, that the conditions are not so favorable in other countries as the working class is demanding for itself." ° Whether the employers act in concert or not, they somehow succeed in striking at the workers together, as is "proved by the simultaneous attacks of the international employers in the various coun-

° *Ibid.*, p. 16.

tries on the eight-hour day and the existing wage rates.”¹⁰

It is the task of the International Trade Secretariats to counteract the injurious effects of international competition and combination on labor. The assumptions are that it is desirable and possible to raise the standards of life and work in all the countries of the world; that higher standards of life mean greater purchasing power for the masses of mankind and greater prosperity for all; that where standards have once reached a higher level, they should be regarded as inviolable; that efforts must be made to strengthen the sense of solidarity among the workers and to make them feel that “each victory carried nationally is a victory for the international working class, whilst each defeat is a defeat of the world’s labor army.”

IV. DEVICES AND METHODS

On these assumptions, the International Trade Secretariats, like the national trade unions, aim at establishing devices ruling out the personal competition of workers and at setting up protective minimum standards. Like the national trade unions also, they rely in the main on the methods of mutual insurance, legal enactment, collective bargaining,¹¹ and education. But in making these devices and

¹⁰ Bulletin of the International Union of Workers in the Food and Drink Trades for January, 1927.

¹¹ For first three methods see Sidney and Beatrice Webb, *Industrial Democracy*.

methods serve international purposes, the Trade Secretariats have had to evolve procedures, rules, and regulations which are in many ways distinctive.

1. Transfers and Benefits

First in point of time and logical sequence are the regulations which may be regarded as international applications of the method of mutual insurance and which have for their purpose the elimination of competition arising out of the movement of workers from country to country. As the Trade Secretariats favor the maximum freedom of movement, these regulations are designed, not to limit the international mobility of labor, but to exercise control over the migrating workers.¹² They deal with transfers of members, traveling benefits, international cards, and the mutual exchange of trade union benefits. It is a rule common to all secretariats that if a member of an affiliated trade union emigrates to another country, he should be admitted to the appropriate trade union in that country without initiation fees.

¹² How important migration is in the life of the workers may be gathered from the fact that in the four years from 1920 to 1924, nearly 3,500,000 persons from 18 countries of Europe left for new lands overseas. During the same period, the six countries of Belgium, Czechoslovakia, Italy, Poland, Roumania, and Sweden, sent out over 1,000,000 persons into other countries of Europe. France alone has received since 1918 over 2,000,000 immigrants, having taken the place in post-war Europe which Germany occupied in this respect in pre-war days. In addition to these, there are the seasonal migrations of workers between neighboring countries in Europe and America and the continual crossing back and forth of workers in the industrial areas of the world which cut across national boundaries.

The provisions of the secretariats vary in the time limit which is allowed for the exercise of this right; in most secretariats members are given from three to six weeks after arrival in the new country to join the union. A trade unionist of one country upon his arrival in a new country has to identify himself, by presenting his card showing membership in the trade union of his home country, to gain admission to the trade union organization in the new country. This provision has given rise to the idea of an international traveling card, but no secretariats have as yet adopted it. The objections to such a card are that it may be easily abused and that it becomes less practicable as more countries using different languages join a secretariat.

Several of the secretariats have provisions for the payment of traveling benefits (*viaticum*) to their members. The secretariats do not keep an international fund for the purpose, but they require their affiliated organizations to have such funds. The arrangement is that a worker migrating in search of work is given money to proceed to another city or country, if he cannot find work on union terms. To receive such benefits, the worker must report to the local trade union and accept work only on terms approved by it. This provision is found in the craft secretariats of the printers, the hatters, the diamond makers, and in such industrial secretariats as the International Union of Workers in the Food and Drink Trades.

The mutual exchange of trade union benefits is in a way a corollary of the right of free transfer. The worker who transfers from the trade union of his home country to a trade union of a new country is anxious not to lose the sick, out-of-work, death, and other benefits to which he is entitled. On the other hand, the extension of trade union benefits is an effective way of keeping in the trade union movement members who contemplate migrating to a new country.

These benefits, however, vary from country to country in amounts paid, in time of payment, and in conditions of membership. The trade unions in the countries where such benefits are well developed are reluctant to extend them to newcomers.¹³ Because of these difficulties, the International Trade Secretariats have proceeded more cautiously in this matter. While the right to transfer is laid down as a strict rule by all secretariats, the right to share in the benefits of the union to which transfer is made is obligatory only in a few of the craft secretariats. In all the others, it is merely contingent. The provision is that such an exchange of benefits should be fixed by special agreements between the affiliated organizations of the secretariats. Such agreements,

¹³ Before the war, the provisions of benefits and of free transfers caused the lukewarm, if not hostile, attitude of the British trade unionists towards the International Trade Secretariats. At present, these are pointed to by many American trade unionists as reasons for staying out of the international trade union movement.

known as "reciprocity treaties," have been made on a large scale, and are an important feature of the structure of the International Trade Secretariats.

Under the method of mutual insurance come also the provisions which all secretariats have for aid in organizing workers in countries where such help is needed. In recent years, considerable sums for this purpose have been sent by many of the secretariats to the Balkan states, to Italy, to Switzerland. Several secretariats also maintain special organizers among the immigrant workers in the frontier districts of Europe.¹⁴

2. Rates and Standards

In contrast to the method of mutual insurance, the method of collective bargaining is more directly concerned with setting up and enforcing minimum rates of wages, standard conditions of work, and a standard or "normal" working day.¹⁵ Within the field of

¹⁴ A novel experiment in organizing was made by the International Building Workers' Union in the winter of 1922-23, in the devastated region of northern France. The French union found itself unable to cope with the large numbers of workers of various nations and languages who flocked into the region. The secretariat then established a special district union of building workers, covering the whole of the devastated region. The Building Workers' Secretariat paid for its maintenance and retained financial control. The workers who joined this union were allowed to retain their membership in their home unions and upon the payment of a special contribution continued to receive their accustomed benefits. The experiment was broken up when the French troops occupied the Ruhr.

¹⁵ These also bring into play the method of legal enactment which is considered in Chapter XIX.

national trade unionism this method has been highly elaborated, but in the domain of international trade unionism it is in its initial stages. Only a few of the trade secretariats attempt to advance the idea of an international rate of wages. At its congress in 1926, the secretariat of general factory workers expressed the view that "since paper is an important product of the world market, it is desirable that wages in the different countries should be brought to the same level." But the expression of such vague wishes is as far as any of the secretariats venture at present.

In so far as methods of wage payments are concerned, several of the secretariats try to promote greater uniformity in their trades. The Hotel Workers' Secretariat urges its members to demand "fixed wages" and the abolition of the tip system. The Diamond Workers' Secretariat is for uniform payment of piece wages. Some of the other secretariats are on record as favoring uniform piece or time wages in special branches or processes of their respective industries.

More headway has been made by the Trade Secretariats in promoting the idea of international standards in matters of safety, sanitation, and improved working conditions in general. Each one of the 27 secretariats has its own list of demands. The painters, for instance, are interested in the question of the use of white lead in industrial processes; the hat-makers' secretariat stresses the issue of mercury poisoning; the glass workers' secretariat is concerned with

"pulmonary tuberculosis and serious digestive troubles due to blowing and to the special diet necessitated by the calling." The bakers have agitated most strenuously for the abolition of night work and of work on Sunday; the transport workers and the workers in the food and drink trades demand that all persons should be forbidden to carry loads of more than 150 pounds; the secretariats of the textile workers, of the general factory workers, and of the tobacco workers have a special interest in protective regulations for women; the railwaymen want safe coupling appliances, while the seamen call for a change in their status aboard ship which would give them the same freedom that workers in other industries have. In addition to these specific programs, all the secretariats support the general program of "Amsterdam" embodied in the International Charter of Labor, the most important item of which is the demand for the eight-hour day.

3. Offense and Defense

There is little as yet in any of the Trade Secretariats which would bring the idea of an international collective agreement within the range of vision. All secretariats, however, aim at influencing the making of collective agreements indirectly by means of those provisions which deal with "offensive and defensive" movements. The rule to which all secretariats hold their affiliated organizations most strictly is that of keeping the workers of one country away from any

country where a strike is on. This is held up as the most elementary duty of international solidarity, and all secretariats are expected to do their utmost in enforcing it. As a trade union device, this rule may be regarded as the international form of picketing.

While international picketing is basic to all the secretariats, the idea of international strikes or boycotts is exceptional. Only the International Transport Workers' Federation has provisions for "promoting and supporting sympathetic strikes, passive resistance and boycotts." The International Miners' Federation has no rules on the subject, but has considered an international strike and an international embargo on coal on several occasions. The International Union of Workers in the Food and Drink Trades has carried on several boycotts on an international scale.¹⁶

What all the secretariats have in common are regulations for financial aid in case of strikes or lockouts. With regard to these regulations, the 27 secretariats fall into four groups. One group consists of secretariats which promise aid in a general way, but which lay down no rules on the matter,

¹⁶ In March, 1928, the Secretary of the International Union of Food and Drink Workers' Organizations sent out a circular urging all workers to boycott about 20 Belgian firms engaged in the manufacture and export of chocolates and other confectioneries. The reason given for the boycott was that the wages paid in this industry were extremely low, not only as compared with wages in other countries, but even with wages in other Belgian industries.

leaving it to the judgment of their executive committees. Ten secretariats are in this group: the glass workers, pottery workers, diamond workers, painters, hairdressers, woodworkers, commercial employees, clothing workers, and post, telegraph and telephone workers.

A second group is formed by the secretariats which have definite rules for the giving of financial aid, but which rely entirely on voluntary collections for the purpose. In this group are nine secretariats—those of the landworkers, factory workers, lithographers, tobacco workers, building trades workers, hotel workers, public service employees, and transport workers. The third group consists of secretariats which provide for special assessments for strike purposes; it includes printers, boot and shoe workers, metal workers, stone cutters, and workers in the food and drink trades. The fourth group is represented by the secretariat of the textile workers which has an international strike fund. In practice, these differences in regulations have so far been of little importance. Most of the strike aid rendered by the secretariats since 1919 has been paid out of collections made through appeals to the membership.

Essential for all their activities, but of special importance to their "offensive and defensive" movements, are the provisions of the secretariats for keeping their members informed on international events and developments in their respective trades. All the secretariats try to make this service as extensive

as possible, but with varying success. Four secretariats have no bulletin at all, and four secretariats have only an irregular one. The best edited of all the journals are those of the woodworkers, metal workers, printers, workers in the food and drink trades, and transport workers. The journals contain valuable material on technical developments in their respective trades, on trade unionism in different countries, and on economic life in general. They carry notices of strikes in different countries, surveys of wage movements, reports of technical and industrial changes, comparative tables of wages. In addition, some of the secretariats publish special reports on conditions in their respective industries.

V. THE SECRETARIATS AS GOING CONCERNS

As going concerns, the 27 secretariats fall into several groups. One consists of those which, owing to their narrow craft basis or to the low degree of trade union organization in their trades, are little more than paper organizations; such are the secretariats of the stone cutters, hatters, hotel and restaurant workers, land workers, hairdressers, which are largely annexes to the German unions in these trades.

The second group includes the secretariats in trades which are largely domestic in character, but which are affected more or less by migration and in which trade unionism has reached a high degree of development in many countries of Europe. Such

are the secretariats of the building trades workers, the printers, lithographers, diamond workers. The chief motive for international action in these secretariats is the control of migratory labor. It is in these secretariats that the provisions for mutual insurance and for financial aid in conflicts have been developed, but there is no inclination to carry activities beyond this point of mutual aid.

A third group embraces the secretariats in the industries which work for world markets or which export in large measure, such as textiles, clothing, boot and shoes, metals, mining, glass, and some of the food producing trades. In this group are some of the largest secretariats in numbers and yet weakest in action; such as the metal workers and miners, with low dues, small offices, and part time secretaries; or the textile workers, with a permanent secretary but no staff, and small resources.

The situation in the third group is explained by three main facts. This group contains the industries which have been most seriously affected by overdevelopment during the war, by post-war financial dislocations, and by the industrialization of new countries. In these industries trade unionism has either always been weak, owing to the large numbers of women and unskilled workers, or has been weakened in recent years as a result of unfavorable economic conditions. Last, but not least, these industries have been built up and are maintained in many

countries by protective tariffs, creating protectionist attitudes among the workers.

At present, most of these secretariats do little more than serve as information bureaus and discussion centers. But there is much agitation in their midst about the need of larger international action, especially in the mining and metal industries. The miners' secretariat is calling for the regulation of the mining industry through an international commission, while the metal workers, faced by the growth of international cartels, are backing the demand for an International Cartel Office under the League of Nations.

A fourth group is formed by the transport workers, —the seamen, dockers, and other port workers. Here the possibilities of prompt and cohesive action are greater than in any other industry, and the effects of such action likely to be much more serious. It is in this secretariat, therefore, that one finds a greater readiness for large international action and a most highly developed and active organization.

VI. PROBLEMS OF GROWTH

1. Wider Fields

In their internal development, the secretariats are faced with three major problems. First and foremost is that of becoming world organizations. In general, the secretariats have a wider distribution of membership than the I. F. T. U. Fourteen of the secretariats have the affiliation of 1,412,000 organ-

ized workers in the United States, Cuba, Brazil, India, the Dutch East Indies, and Australia.¹⁷

Nevertheless, the 27 secretariats comprise only about a third of the organized workers of the world—some 13 million out of 40 million—and are essentially European organizations. Their affiliations outside of Europe either affect small unions or are nominal in character. American trade union officials, for instance, do not take much interest in the work of their secretariats. Distance, doctrinal differences, racial exclusivism, and a feeling that affiliation cannot be of material benefit to them still keep the bulk of organized labor in the United States, Latin America, and Australia outside the secretariats. In Europe, the question of communism keeps out the Russian trade unions. So far only the International Union of Workers in the Food and Drink Trades has admitted the Russian unions of that industry to membership. The other secretariats have for the time being agreed to consider the "Russian question" closed until the I. F. T. U. comes to an agreement with the All-Russian Trade Union Council.

¹⁷ See Press Reports of the I. F. T. U. for December 6, 1928. The American trade unions which are affiliated with their respective Trade Secretariats are the United Mine Workers, the International Association of Machinists, the United Brotherhood of Carpenters and Joiners, the United Brotherhood of Painters, the International Ladies' Garment Workers' Union, the Bakery and Confectionery Workers of America, the Boot and Shoe Workers' Union, the National Federation of Post Office clerks, the International Longshoremen's Association, the Journeymen Tailors' Union, and a few others with a total membership of 1,283,763.

2. Personnel and Technique

A second group of problems is connected with questions of personnel and technique. The success of a secretariat depends in large measure upon the personality of its secretary. At present, the secretaries differ greatly in type, temperament, and equipment for their position. Some of them are qualified more for routine duties. Only a few may be said to be fit for international leadership, have a command of several languages, a wide knowledge of their industry and of world affairs in general, are capable of addressing large audiences, and have the tact for adjusting international differences.

It is difficult at present to obtain a more vigorous and better equipped leadership for the secretariats. The number of qualified trade unionists is small.¹⁸ Those that are better trained and more experienced are unwilling to accept the position or to give all their time to it. As a rule, such trade unionists hold important positions in their own countries as labor officials, as members of parliament or both. They are reluctant to give up the emoluments and prestige of their positions at home for the uncertain career which most secretariats at present offer.

In addition, there is the complicating factor of nationalities. As a result of the war, many secretariats have their headquarters in Switzerland and

¹⁸ There is no international training school for labor leaders and officials corresponding to the national labor colleges in the different countries.

Holland and are managed by Dutch and Swiss labor officials. In others, the secretary is chosen from the country which plays a leading part in the industry. The secretary of the textile secretariat is British, while the secretaries of the shoe workers' secretariat and of several other secretariats are German. Neither principle of selection, however, results necessarily in the choice of the best men.

Few of the secretariats are adequately equipped even for the work of translation and editing, which is their chief job today. Often this work is done by moderately paid assistants or outside translators entirely too dependent on the dictionary. Even less are the secretariats equipped for statistical inquiries. Though most of the secretaries are ready to turn statisticians at the first opportunity, and some of them have had a fair amount of practice, their endeavors are only too often frustrated by amateur methods.

It has been suggested from time to time that the secretariats should all have their headquarters in the same city. This would enable them to combine resources for purposes of printing, translation, and other work. Such an arrangement, however, does not seem practicable at present because of the belief that each can do its work best in a different city, because of different national affiliations, and because of the unwillingness of the secretaries to make changes which would uproot personal and family connections.

3. Secretariats or National Centers

The third problem centers around the relations between the Trade Secretariats and "Amsterdam." A few, notably Edo Fimmen of the Transport Workers' Federation, would make the secretariats the basis of the entire "Amsterdam system," eliminating altogether the "national centers." This proposal is based on the idea that the world is entering a "new era" of rapid internationalization and that as a result leadership must "pass from the national organizations to the International Trade Secretariats." Fimmen admits that the secretariats are still "in the very earliest stages of their activities," but "several years" seem to him long enough for them to pass from their present state to that of "practical and theoretical leadership in industrial struggles."

At the other extreme, most of the leaders of the secretariats ¹⁰ hold that the "internationalization of capital" is growing but slowly, and that competition between employers of different countries is more important than their combinations. These leaders also stress the "lack of international sentiment" among the workers and the persistence of national and craft attitudes within the secretariats. For these reasons, they claim that "industrial struggles" must remain for a long time national in scope, that the International Trade Secretariats can play merely

¹⁰ The chief exponents of this view are Fritz Tarnow, chairman of the International Union of Woodworkers, and Conrad Ilg, secretary of the International Metal Workers' Federation.

an auxiliary and secondary part, and that leadership must remain in the hands of the national centers, organized internationally in "Amsterdam."

Between the two extremes are those who demand a rearrangement which would make the secretariats and the national centers co-ordinate and equal members in one international organization.

CHAPTER XIX

AMSTERDAM AND GENEVA

Had the leaders of "Amsterdam" had their way in 1919, there would now be in existence an international labor parliament with power to pass laws binding on national governments.¹ Owing to the play of forces at the time, there emerged from the hands of the Versailles Peace Commission, not such a parliament, but the International Labor Organization of the League of Nations, an institution half way between a parliament and an advisory body and designed as a compromise to reconcile the ideas and purposes of governments, employers, and labor unions in various stages of development.

Though a compromise, the I. L. O.² was accepted by "Amsterdam" as a concession to, and an auxiliary for, organized labor. It continues to be so regarded by labor today, and on this view "Amsterdam" bases its policy of co-operation with it.

I. HOW THE I. L. O. WORKS

The manner in which such co-operation is effected is bound up with the structure and operation of the

¹ See Chapter VIII, p. 189.

² These letters are used to designate both the International Labor Organization and its administrative organ—the International Labor Office.

I. L. O. As shaped at Versailles, the I. L. O. is part of the League of Nations, largely autonomous, resting on sanctions provided for in the Treaty of Peace. All states which are members of the League are *ipso facto* members of the I. L. O. From its beginning, however, the I. L. O. admitted states which were not members of the League, such as Germany and Austria. Also states which at one time or another left the League—Spain, Argentina, Brazil—continued their membership in the I. L. O. The number of states holding membership in the I. L. O. has thus exceeded from time to time the number of states in the League. At present, the number of members in the League is 54, while the I. L. O. has 55 members.

1. The Annual Conference

Membership in the I. L. O. means that the member states can take part in the work of three organs which form the mechanism of the I. L. O.—the General Conference of Representatives of the Members, the International Labor Office, and the Governing Body. The General Conference meets annually in Geneva, and is composed of delegates selected by the member states.³ Each member state can appoint four delegates to the General Conference. Two are known as Government Delegates and are appointed

³ The first General Conference was held in 1919 in the building of the Pan-American Union in Washington; the second in 1920 was held in Genoa. Since 1921, all sessions of the General Conference have been held in Geneva. Eleven sessions of the General Conference have thus far been held.

by the governments unconditionally and act on government instructions. The other two delegates are chosen by the governments in agreement with, and on nomination of, the most representative organizations of employers and workers in the country. These delegates are known in the General Conference as Employers' and Workers' Delegates respectively. In addition to the delegates, the Conferences are attended by technical advisers, each delegate being allowed not more than two advisers for each item on the agenda.

So far, no annual session of the General Conference has had a full representation. Some governments send no delegates at all; others send incomplete delegations.⁴ The reasons for this vary. In some countries, there are no labor organizations; in others, the government fails to recognize those in existence; in a few countries, e.g. Norway, the trade unions oppose the League of Nations and refuse to take part in the I. L. O.

Under the rules of the I. L. O., each delegate votes individually on all matters before the Conference, and a simple majority of the votes cast by the delegates present is sufficient for a decision, except as

⁴ The Eleventh Conference, held in May, 1928, for instance, was attended by 139 delegates and 185 technical advisers from 42 countries. Seven of these countries—China, Chile, Peru, Paraguay, Salvador, Guatemala, Nicaragua—had only Government Delegates. The Workers' Delegates numbered 34, and they were accompanied by 56 technical advisers. The governments had 73 delegates and 78 advisers, while the employers had 32 delegates and 51 advisers.

otherwise specified. On many questions, the Conferences have been able to reach unanimous agreement. But frequently the Employers' and Workers' Delegates cast solid opposing votes,⁵ agreeing upon their course of action in advance in caucus. The Government Delegates generally divide their votes, some voting with the employers, some with the workers; and as they have at least half the votes, they control the decisions of the Conferences.

It is the primary business of the General Conference to try to arrive at Draft Conventions. A Draft Convention is the legal text of a proposed international treaty on labor or social matters. If approved by a two-thirds vote of the Conference, a Draft Convention must be submitted by the member states to the competent authorities for the enactment of legislation before the expiration of 12 or, in exceptional cases, of 18 months. The legislature of any country is free to ratify or to reject any Draft Convention submitted to it. If the legislature ratifies a Draft Convention, it is under obligation to embody the provisions of such Convention in the laws of the country. If a Draft Convention is rejected, there is no further obligation on the member state.

A Recommendation is merely a statement of general principles underlying legislation on any particular labor or social question. Like a Draft Conven-

⁵ At times the workers have split their votes; the Australians, for instance, opposed the white lead convention, for fear that it would threaten the lead-mining industry of Australia.

tion, it must be approved by a two-thirds vote of the Conference, and if so approved, must be submitted by the government of every member state to the proper authorities for consideration. But in contrast to a Draft Convention, a Recommendation is not meant for ratification, but for the guidance of member states in labor and social legislation.⁶ It has a preliminary and provisional character, its purpose being to start an educational process.

Draft Conventions, and to a less degree Recommendations, are the instruments of the I. L. O. for the attainment of the end for which it was created, namely to raise the level of labor throughout the world. In the Treaty of Versailles this end is expressed somewhat ambiguously. In one place, it is described as merely subsidiary to the cause of universal peace; in another, it is declared to be "of supreme international importance" in itself.

In whatever way viewed, however, the assumption is that this end must be attained through the establishment of universal minimum standards by means of international agreement. The presuppositions are the same which underlie international trade unionism.⁷ What is distinctive of the I. L. O. is the method used, the method of legislative enactment, which finds its highest expression in the ratification

⁶ Federal states, such as the United States of America, have the right to treat a Draft Convention as a Recommendation only, if their power of entering into agreements on the matters contained in the Convention is limited.

⁷ See Chapter XVIII, pp. 457-461.

of a Draft Convention. For when a Draft Convention is ratified by all the member states, it must result in similar labor laws in all the countries, presumably tending to equalize standards and to elevate labor above the level of being merely an article of commerce and an element of international competition.

2. The Labor Office

The General Conference which drafts Conventions is the heart of the I. L. O. The International Labor Office is subsidiary to it, acting as its secretariat. But while the General Conference, as a legislative body, meets periodically, the International Labor Office, as the administrative body, is a permanent organization. It is housed in a spacious, though plain, five-story building, in a park on the shores of Lake Geneva, just outside the city limits within a short distance from the Secretariat of the League of Nations. In many ways, this building on Lake Geneva and the organization which it houses symbolize the advance of labor in international life during the last 100 years. From the entrance doors through its various halls and rooms, the building is ornamented with gifts from many governments and labor organizations, giving the whole a distinct international atmosphere. The staff gathered within is the largest international body of men and women assembled anywhere for the purpose of considering the labor and social problems of the world as a unit.

It consists of 350 persons, representing many shades of opinion and a great variety of experience and training, and drawn from 34 different nationalities. About \$1,563,000 was spent in 1928 in maintaining the Office and its branches.⁸

As the secretariat, or "civil service," of the I. L. O., the International Labor Office has four major tasks. One is to arrange the meetings of the General Conference, to prepare the agenda for it, to provide translators and secretaries, to publish reports of the daily proceedings, and in every other way to facilitate its work. The second task is diplomatic in character—to maintain official contacts with governments, workers and employers in the interval between the meetings of the General Conference. The third is semi-official—to keep in touch with industrial and social organizations which influence public opinion. The fourth is that of investigation and information.

For the performance of these tasks, the International Labor Office is organized in three divisions. The Diplomatic Division handles official communications with governments, workers, and employers. It follows up the course of ratification by correspondence with governments; distributes questionnaires when the Office is undertaking a comprehensive study. It acts as the secretariat for the

⁸ The I. L. O. has national officers in Rome, Berlin, Paris, London, Washington, Delhi, Tokio; and national correspondents in Warsaw, Budapest, Vienna, Prague, Brussels, Madrid and Rio de Janeiro.

Conference, preparing the documents used by the Conference, and keeping the minutes.

The Intelligence and Liaison Division, or Relations Division, maintains contacts with workers' and employers' organizations. Four officers, three of whom are former officials of trade unions affiliated with "Amsterdam," keep in touch with the I. F. T. U.; one corresponds with the Christian trade unions; two officials deal with employers' organizations, and a special section deals with co-operative societies.

The Research Division collects and compiles information for the Conference, for governments, and for employers' and workers' organizations. It also carries on continuous research on social insurance, unemployment, industrial hygiene, hours of labor, and undertakes special inquiries upon subjects which are placed on the agenda of the Conference.⁹

At the head of the Office is a director who is assisted by a deputy director. Since the organization of the Office, these two posts have been filled by Albert Thomas of France, and by H. B. Butler, of England. The heads of the three Divisions are responsible to the director who has the power of appointment of the entire staff.

⁹ The regular publications of the Office include Industrial and Labour Information (weekly); International Labour Review (monthly); Monthly Record of Migration; Industrial Safety Survey (every two months); Bibliography of Industrial Hygiene (quarterly). The Legislative series (annual) collects labor laws and regulations of all countries, and is now being supplemented by an International Survey of Legal Decisions on Labor Law.

3. The Governing Body

The executive organ of the I. L. O. is the Governing Body, which consists of 24 members elected every three years by the General Conference. The governments, workers and employers are represented on the Governing Body in the same proportion as in the Conference; the governments have twelve seats; the workers six; the employers six. Eight of the government representatives are nominated by the eight states regarded as of chief industrial importance.¹⁰ The other four delegates are elected by the remaining governments. The employers' and workers' representatives are elected by the Employers' and Workers' Delegates respectively.

As executive organ, the Governing Body exercises general control over the Labor Office. It appoints the Director of the Office and issues general instructions for his guidance. It considers questions to be placed on the agenda of the General Conference. It also passes upon requests for information involving prolonged or extensive studies which come either from the Conference, in connection with subjects for Draft Conventions and Recommendations, or from member states, or from workers' and employers' organizations.

4. The I. L. O. and the League

In all these activities, the I. L. O. acts as an autonomous body. But it is dependent on the League

¹⁰ These states are Great Britain, France, Germany, Belgium, Italy, India, Japan, and Canada.

of Nations in several ways. Its budget is voted by the Assembly of the League out of the general funds of the League,¹¹ and the Director of the Office is responsible to the Assembly of the League for an accounting. In matters of representation on the Governing Body, the Council of the League has the right to decide which countries are of chief industrial importance.

In connection with the ratification of Draft Conventions, the League has the functions of an intermediary. A copy of every Convention or Recommendation adopted by the General Conference has to be deposited with the Secretary-General of the League, and the latter is entrusted with the task of communicating all such Conventions and Recommendations to the members of the I. L. O. Every member state of the I. L. O., ratifying a Convention, has to notify the Secretary-General of the League and the formal ratification is then registered by him.

Close relations exist in regard to the enforcement of Conventions. Each member state is required to send in annually an account to the International Labor Office showing the measures it has taken to enforce the Conventions ratified. The Governing Body of the I. L. O. determines in what form such an account shall be made and what particulars it shall contain.

In case a complaint is brought against a govern-

¹¹ This budget covers all expenses of the I. L. O., except traveling expenses of delegates and technical advisers attending meetings of the General Conference and of the Governing Body.

ment by employers or workers or by another government, for the non-observance of a Convention, the Secretary-General of the League nominates a Commission of Inquiry of three.¹² After such Commission has made its report, the government concerned may take its case to the Permanent Court of International Justice of the League of Nations, whose decision is final. The powers of a Commission of Inquiry extend to the right to recommend "economic" measures against the defaulting government to be taken by all the other member states of the I. L. O., subject to modification by the Court of International Justice. The Secretary-General of the League acts as intermediary in communicating the decisions taken to the governments concerned.

While these provisions place in its hands powers of coercion, the I. L. O. relies on persuasion and negotiation. Up to the present, no steps have been taken against any government beyond making complaints in the Conference.¹³

¹² This procedure is resorted to only if the Governing Body fails to reach a satisfactory settlement. The three persons are drawn from a panel nominated by the member states. All persons nominated may be rejected by the Governing Body by a two-thirds vote.

¹³ At the 1925 Conference, the representative of the Japanese Seamen's Union complained that the Japanese government had failed to put into effect a Convention which it had ratified, making it obligatory to replace the system of private employment agencies for sailors with a state agency. The Conference referred the matter to the Governing Body. Here the Japanese Government Delegate gave an explanation of the delay and showed how

II. ACTIVITIES AND OUTLOOK

Since it was launched upon its career in 1919, the I. L. O. has passed through three stages. From 1919 to 1921, in the first flush of enthusiasm and under the pressure of world upheaval, emphasis was upon the making of Draft Conventions and reliance was mainly upon the backing of labor organizations affiliated with "Amsterdam." Sixteen Conventions were drawn up at the three General Conferences held during these years, including those which were regarded as of prime importance by labor. In the making of these Conventions, the Workers' Delegates played a leading part, and were backed by the Government Delegates who felt that concessions to labor were essential, if the tide of social revolution was to be stemmed.

During the second stage, from 1921 to 1924, as a result of economic depression and of complaints that some of the Conventions had been drawn up too hastily, a halt was called on the making of Draft Conventions. Emphasis was shifted to negotiations with governments to obtain ratification of the Conventions already drafted, to propaganda, and to research. The administration of the Office was con-

much progress had been made. The following year the workers, while admitting progress, again complained of delay; the government was again able to satisfy the Governing Body that it was putting the reform through to the best of its ability, although slowly. At the 1927 Conference the question was not again raised, as the Japanese seamen had expressed their satisfaction to the Office.

solidated, the personnel increased, and the methods of work reorganized. Other labor organizations besides "Amsterdam," such as the International Federation of Christian Trade Unions, came in to lend their support.¹⁴ Outside experts were called in to serve on various committees which were established as advisory bodies to recommend improvements in the work of the International Labor Office.

Since 1924, the I. L. O. has been in its third and present stage. Draft Conventions are again the order of the day, but at a greatly reduced pace.¹⁵ Much more time is devoted to the preparation of Drafts under the new system, known as the method of "Double Discussion."¹⁶ Increasingly more at-

¹⁴ The Christian trade unions were represented at the General Conference of the I. L. O. for the first time in 1922. In that year, the three Christian trade union federations of Holland, which together outnumbered the trade unions affiliated with "Amsterdam," combined to nominate a delegate whom they put forward as the most representative of the Dutch workers. The case was carried to the Permanent Court of International Justice at The Hague, which ruled in favor of the Christian unions.

¹⁵ At the sessions of 1925, 1926, 1927, and 1928, nine Conventions were adopted, relating to workmen's compensation, night work in bakeries, emigrants, seamen's articles of agreement, health insurance, and to minimum wage laws.

¹⁶ Under this method, before a Draft Convention is drawn up, the General Conference first discusses the issues involved and draws up a questionnaire on the subject. In drawing up the questionnaire, it uses the materials prepared for it by the International Labor Office. The questionnaire is then dispatched by the Labor Office to the various governments which are expected to send in replies. On the basis of the replies, the Office prepares a tentative Draft which is discussed by the General Conference the following year. In this way, a Draft Convention goes through two discussions by two annual sessions of the General Conference before it is adopted.

tention is devoted to research and to the service of information.¹⁷ At the same time, greater emphasis is placed on the social solidarity of all classes in matters of social legislation. Accordingly, while seeking the support of labor organizations, the I. L. O. puts the direction of, and the responsibility for, progress not so much upon them, as upon the humanitarian good-will and co-operation of governments of whatever party, upon the desire of employers to establish rules for international competition, and upon the forces backing the League of Nations. While soliciting the aid of trade unions of different, even hostile, trends, it is developing closer contacts with co-operative, educational, capitalist, and charitable societies, women's organizations, League of Nations' societies, associations of ex-service men, and the International Association for Social Progress; and much time and attention is given to making the work of the Office known to the general public.

¹⁷ The extent and variety of these activities may be illustrated by a few figures. In 1926, 136 requests for information were received from governments; 42 from employers' organizations; 125 from workers' organizations; 25 from co-operatives; 16 from associations of disabled men; 468 from miscellaneous bodies and individuals. These requests related to 35 different classes of information of which the most numerous pertained to hours of work, wages, and working conditions. The Office received, during 1926, 33,000 letters, and sent out 40,000. It was in correspondence with 47 countries, of which 32 sent over 100 letters apiece. The letters were in 23 languages. The library of the I. L. O. received about 20,000 books and pamphlets during the year.

III. THROUGH "AMSTERDAM'S" EYES

From the point of view of "Amsterdam," participation in the I. L. O. offers certain definite advantages. Through the I. L. O., "Amsterdam" appears before the world as the recognized spokesman of labor. For though the Christian and the Fascist unions are also admitted by the I. L. O., "Amsterdam" controls the Workers' Delegates at the General Conference and fills the seats of the Workers' Representatives on the Governing Body.¹⁸

Even the Christian unions, though defending their own point of view, act with "Amsterdam" on all important occasions. Because of this, "Amsterdam" is reconciled to the presence of the delegates from the Christian unions in the I. L. O. It protests strongly, however, against the admission of delegates from the Fascist unions.¹⁹

Through its position in the I. L. O., "Amsterdam" plays the part it does in the League of Nations. It is because of its work in the I. L. O. that "Amsterdam" has secured representation upon the various

¹⁸ At the General Conference of 1928, for instance, of the 90 Workers' Delegates and advisers, 54 represented organizations affiliated with "Amsterdam," seven were from Christian trade unions, and five from the Fascist unions of Italy. Of the remaining, 20 were in sympathy with "Amsterdam."

¹⁹ The delegate of the latter from Italy, Rossoni, has appeared at the General Conference since 1924, but every year the leaders of "Amsterdam" attack him and demand his exclusion. Though Rossoni votes with the Workers' Group, he is practically boycotted by "Amsterdam."

commissions of the League and on the committees organized by the Economic Conference of the League.

Next in importance is the utilization by "Amsterdam" of the International Labor Office for purposes of research. The Trade Secretariats especially have come to regard the Office as a technical research staff to which they can appeal for information, and for carrying out more extensive studies for which they themselves are not equipped.

Of importance also is the indirect aid which the I. L. O. offers for purposes of organization. The Annual Conferences of the I. L. O. give "Amsterdam" an opportunity to make contacts with labor men from South America, Asia, South Africa, and other distant parts, with which otherwise its contacts are meager. In several other ways, the activities of the I. L. O. carry the idea of trade unionism to the workers. These indirect influences have aroused dissatisfaction in quarters hostile to "Amsterdam," and the Director of the International Labor Office has been accused at times "of making the Office a branch of 'Amsterdam.'"

On the other hand, co-operation between "Amsterdam" and the I. L. O. runs up against some difficulties. "Amsterdam" does not approve the policy of the Office to treat "impartially" all trade unions, including the Fascist. It is inclined to question some of the research of the I. L. O. as failing to meet

the needs of organized labor.²⁰ It finds the emphasis of the I. L. O. on class co-operation somewhat too inconsistent and embarrassing, in view of its own tendency to maintain a balance between such ideas and the doctrines of class struggle. And it is greatly disappointed at the failure of the I. L. O., so far, to win employers and governments to an unquestioned acceptance of trade unionism.²¹

"Amsterdam" is also coming to feel that there are inherent limits in the very method and functions of the I. L. O. After ten years' experience, the processes of making Draft Conventions, and especially of ratifying them, appear cumbersome, slow, and uncertain. For the 26 Draft Conventions, drawn up since 1919, 304 ratifications have been secured. This is about a third of the 1,000 to 1,200 ratifications which are possible. Twenty-five countries have not ratified a single Convention, while most of the other countries have ratified less than half of the 26 Conventions. In international affairs, the method of legal enactment is thus seen to be as slow, if not slower, than in national life.

Aside from being slow, it is also seen to be uncer-

²⁰ In radical labor and communist circles, the publications of the I. L. O. are said to be affected by an anti-Russian bias.

²¹ This was made clear at the Conference of 1927 in connection with the discussion of the questionnaire on trade union liberty. Employers' and Government Delegates made so many limiting amendments in the questionnaire and inserted so many definitions infringing on what "Amsterdam" regards as elementary trade union rights, that the Workers' Delegates preferred to vote against it.

tain. This is the lesson drawn by labor especially from the experience with the Convention on the Eight-Hour Day. As related elsewhere, the Eight-Hour Day Convention was hailed as *the* great achievement and the symbol of the promise of the I. L. O. Yet in ten years, this Convention has been ratified unconditionally only by seven countries: Belgium, Bulgaria, Chile, Czechoslovakia, Greece, India (here ten-hours are stipulated by the Convention), and Rumania; while France, Italy, Latvia, and Austria, have ratified only on condition that other countries ratify too. And now, the British Government is asking for a revision of the Convention to curtail the provisions favorable to labor.²²

Far-reaching also are the questions raised by the incidence and effects of Conventions. So far, ratifications have been most numerous either in the new post-war states of Europe or in the Orient. In such countries as Poland, Czechoslovakia, or the states bordering on Russia, progress in ratifications has been prompted in part by the desire of these new governments to count in public opinion as progressive states, in part by their anxiety to cut the ground from under the extremists and revolutionaries. In the Orient, working conditions are so low that some improvement is urgently called for.²³ But in most of these countries, the adminis-

²² See Chapter XV, p. 382.

²³ India's ratification of the Washington Conventions, abolishing night work for women, limiting the employment of children, fix-

tration of labor legislation is defective, making the value of ratification doubtful.²⁴

Elements of friction between "Amsterdam" and the International Labor Office are inevitable. Because of this, there are some who would like to weaken "Amsterdam" in the expectation that it would mean less reliance on trade unionism among the workers and greater interest in the possibilities of legislation, thus giving the I. L. O. a preponderant rôle in the field of labor and social progress. Others would steer the I. L. O. away from labor laws and Conventions altogether, into lines of research. They would extend the work of research into the fields of social life, industrial management, and general economic conditions on the grounds that labor cannot be separated from other economic and social factors. On the other hand, there are voices

ing a ten-hour day for adult male workers, are counted by the I. L. O. among its most important achievements. Japan, too, has made important steps forward by ratifying some of the Conventions, though it has not ratified as many as India. In South America practically nothing has been done; which is ascribed in large measure to the weakness of labor organizations. In the Mandates and Colonies little has been done towards applying the Draft Conventions.

²⁴ In 1925, Great Britain complained that a number of states were getting credit for ratifications while not raising their laws to the necessary level, or not enforcing them, thus preserving inequalities in competition to the disadvantage of more conscientious countries. Accordingly, a committee of experts was appointed to examine with care the reports sent in by member governments upon progress of legislation, and to check up on the operation of the laws. It is claimed that this procedure has already had some success and that it will facilitate ratifications by the more advanced industrial countries.

in the ranks of the trade unions against co-operation with the I. L. O.

However, the forces making for continued co-operation between the I. L. O. and "Amsterdam" are strongest. As long as employers and governments maintain present attitudes, the I. L. O. cannot but look to labor for support. On the other hand, "Amsterdam" cannot give up lightly co-operation with the I. L. O. Such co-operation is too closely connected with its whole outlook and with its policy in regard to the League of Nations. In the near future, as in the present, "Amsterdam" will thus work with the I. L. O., though continuing to criticize it, and will try to gain a greater measure of control over it.

CHAPTER XX

THE CHALLENGE OF COMMUNISM

Four score years ago, Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels announced in the opening sentence of the "Communist Manifesto" that a ghost was stalking through Europe, the ghost of communism, and in its name they hurled defiance at all socialist and reformist groups of the time. Today, the communist ghost is stalking through all the continents of the world, and is challenging socialists, reformists, and trade unionists—the Amsterdam International and its allies—for the leadership and control of the international labor movement.

How the communist challenge affects the international labor movement depends on the organizations in which it is embodied. But as in the other sections of the labor movement, the work of the communist organizations can be clearly visualized only in relation to the doctrines which guide and inspire it. Whatever intrinsic value they may have, these doctrines are an essential element of the communist movement, and must be grasped as a whole in order that one may see what the communist challenge is and what part each communist organization has in making it effective.

I. MARX AND LENIN

In hurling their challenge against "Amsterdam" and the socialists, the communists lay claim to the exclusive heritage of Marx—"the mighty theoretician of the social revolution." The socialists, according to the communists, have, since 1914, been "vulgarizing," mutilating, and falsifying Marx in order to make him safe for "class peace" and "democracy." The Austro-Marxists, no less than the others, are flayed by the communists as "adulterers of Marxism," who use Marxist words to screen their fear of revolutionary action. In contrast, the communists claim to combat "all forms of bourgeois philosophy," and to "advocate, propagate, and apply" Marx's method of dialectical materialism.

Since Marxism is not a dogma, but a "method of analysis and of struggle," say the communists, there is no need of revising Marx, but only of applying correctly his method and basic ideas to the new world realities. That is what Lenin did, and by so doing, gave Marx's doctrines a new lease of life. Lenin's contributions consist in his analysis of Imperialism and of proletarian dictatorship, in his theory of class relations, and in his conception of the relations between the revolutionary movements in industrial countries and the nationalist movements in colonial countries. Leninism is thus not a revision, but a "completion of Marxism."

As Leninism-Marxism, communism is a theory

and program of universal or world social revolution in process of realization. It is a new social synthesis concerned with the aims, dynamics, and laws of the revolutionary process.

II. COMMUNIST IDEALS

Broadly, the aim of the social revolution is the establishment of a communist society throughout the world. Without entering into detail, the communists picture such a society as one in which general harmony, universal well-being, and individual freedom prevail. It is a society from which all the causes of modern social inequalities have been eliminated. Man is no longer "enslaved to the principle of the division of labor"; the opposition between brain and manual work is gone; labor ceases to be a mere means of supporting life and becomes one of the first necessities of life; all members of society co-operate in the labor of "a single world society"; an uninterrupted torrent of goods is made to flow through a consciously planned system of socialized production; the state vanishes as an instrument of force; all exploitation of man by man is abolished; society holds high the banner on which is inscribed the motto: "From each according to his ability; to each according to his needs"; and free from economic and social conflicts, humanity develops a common culture based on science and reason.¹

¹ This is a summary of the well-known passage from the Gotha Letter of Marx which is quoted and fully accepted by Lenin in his book on "The State and Revolution" and which is restated in

Communists do not claim to know when such a society may become a reality. "We know," wrote Lenin, "that we are not now in a position to introduce this social order; let us hope that this order will be established by our children, or perhaps even among our grandchildren."² In another connection, Lenin said that such a social condition may "never arrive."³ But whether it arrives or not, or whenever it may arrive, this "higher phase of communism" must be thought of as the "final goal" towards which the social revolution is moving and which is the ultimate justification of communist activities.

Before entering this final state, society must pass through the intermediate stage of a "lower phase of communism," or socialism. In the communist society abundance and freedom are visualized as the basis of human relations. Under socialism, productivity and efficiency will not be high enough to permit an economy of abundance, and it will be necessary to maintain strict control of economic processes and a thorough accountancy of outgo and income. Owing to the survival of old habits and attitudes, there will persist in a socialist society many inequalities of distribution, a large element of force in social relations, and many of the functions and powers of the state will have to be retained.

the new communist program. It is paraphrased by communist writers for popular propaganda.

² Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. XVI, p. 398 (in Russian); quoted in *International Press Correspondence*, January 6, 1927.

³ Lenin, *State and Revolution*, p. 102.

These will disappear gradually as mankind "subordinates itself to the forces of nature" and becomes trained in the spirit of communism. But socialism will prepare the ground for this change by habituating the people to social ownership and planful economy, to large-scale production, to an industrialized agriculture, to co-operative exchange, to a nationalized credit system, and to a more equal distribution, under the control and direction of a Socialist State.

However, socialism also must be built up consciously and systematically, and the process will extend over a "prolonged epoch of intensive work." Another interval is, therefore, inevitable—a transitional period of "revolutionary transformation" from capitalism to socialism. This "transition period" will be characterized by the forcible and progressive nationalization of economic life and by the gradual construction of socialist institutions, carried out under a system of "proletarian dictatorship." Its prototype is the economic and political system existing in Russia today, with variations to suit conditions in different countries.⁴

III. THE DICTATORSHIP OF THE PROLETARIAT

That the communist society must be built gradually and consciously, gives rise to the problem of method. The central question is, how is the change to be made to socialism during the "transition

⁴ For the Russian economic system, see pp. 341-350.

period." The communist answer to this question is based on theories of the state, of class struggle, class dictatorship, and party leadership, which form the elements of the characteristic communist doctrine of "proletarian dictatorship."

Following Marx, the communists regard the state as "the product and the manifestation of the irreconcilability of class antagonism."⁵ The state has always been, is, and can be nothing else than an organ of class domination and of oppression of one class by another. The fundamental feature of the state is that the officials who are supposed to be the "servants of the people" become the rulers of society and use the organs of government in the interests of the dominant class and of their own rule. A "free" or "popular" state is a contradiction in terms; there can be no such thing. Democracy also is a state which recognizes the subjection of the minority to the majority and which uses force in the interests of one or another class. "Pure democracy" is "the mendacious phrase of a liberal who wants to dupe the working class." In fact, democracy is either "bourgeois" or "proletarian." "Bourgeois democracy" is "a very limited, a very hypocritical institution, a paradise for the rich and a delusion for the exploited and for the poor."

After socialism has been established, the state will gradually and peacefully "wither away." But while

⁵ Lenin, *State and Revolution*, p. 7. This book, in communist opinion, is "the most important work since '*Capital*.'"

the transition to socialism is being effected, the proletariat must use the state; its "centralized organization of force and violence," in order to nationalize industry, to crush the "resistance of the exploiters," and to enforce those economic measures by means of which society is to be changed into a socialist state.

However, the workers cannot use the present capitalistic state, even in its highest form of a democratic republic, to achieve their purposes. It is "of the very essence of revolution" that "a new class shall not govern by means of the old governmental machinery, but that it shall smash that machinery and govern by means of a new machine." The proletariat must set up in place of "bourgeois democracy" a state form of its own, namely, a "proletarian democracy," which is exemplified by the Soviet System of Russia. This "proletarian Soviet state" will vary from country to country, but it must have these elements in common: the electorate must include only the toiling and exploited masses and exclude the bourgeoisie; the electoral system must be based on work and not on residence; officials must not receive high salaries and must be subject to recall at any time; there must be no division between legislative, executive, and judiciary powers; the bourgeoisie must be completely disarmed, while the proletariat is armed; and above all, the industrial proletariat must play a leading part in the exercise of the powers of the state. "Proletarian

democracy" so organized is "the dictatorship of the proletariat," that is, a regime in which state power is concentrated "in its entirety in the hands of the proletariat" and in which the ruling class, that is the proletariat, is guided by considerations of revolutionary policy.

While the industrial workers are the true standard-bearers of the social revolution, they cannot carry through its program alone, because in most countries they are a minority of the population. It is for this reason that the question of the relations of the industrial workers to the peasantry is of supreme importance. The peasants or farmers, though forming the majority of the population of the world, are incapable of playing an independent and leading part in history. Divided into three groups—that of rich peasants, middle peasants, and poor peasants—the agricultural population cannot develop sufficient cohesion from within and must act in alliance either with the bourgeoisie or with the industrial workers.

In the past, the farming population has followed the lead of the big bourgeoisie. Today, the majority of the peasant organizations and farmers' societies are still "morally and physically" under the domination of the landlords and capitalists. It is out of the question for the proletariat to win over to its side the rich peasants and farmers. But all political and economic developments, such as the agricultural crisis, the growing burdens of milita-

rism, the dangers of new wars, are preparing the minds of the agricultural population for new points of view. The proletariat can and must "neutralize" the middle peasants and "win the sympathies" of the small peasantry by appropriate promises and performances. An alliance between the middle and poor peasantry and the proletariat is a necessary condition of social revolution and the basis of proletarian dictatorship.

To exercise their class dictatorship, the workers and peasants must have not only their own state form, but also their own political party to guide the "proletarian state." Such a party is the Communist Party, "the vanguard of the proletariat," which must assume sole and undisputed leadership in carrying out the program of the social revolution. In other words, the "dictatorship of the proletariat" is inseparable from the dictatorship of the Communist Party. The reason for that lies in the relations between a social class and a political dictatorship. A class, the working-class included, is formed of heterogeneous elements on different levels of development and given to varying moods. A dictatorship, on the other hand, presupposes unity of will and of action. To secure a class dictatorship, it is necessary to place supreme power in the hands of a political party which has a clear program of action and a faultless, internal discipline.

Class dictatorship in general, and the dictatorship of the working class in particular, involves the use

of violence. A violent revolution is necessary to seize the powers of government. Violent methods must be used afterwards to eliminate the capitalists and large landholders who are hostile to the socialist idea and to disarm the middle class and the small peasantry until they can be won over to the ideas of the working class. Revolutions are like wars, they kill individuals and intimidate the masses. In exercising its dictatorship, the Communist Party must use force even against those elements of the working class which, for one reason or another, oppose and hamper its revolutionary program. The violence involved in the "dictatorship of the proletariat" can diminish in severity only as the workers succeed in establishing their power and in destroying resistance to the construction of socialism.

IV. THE DYNAMICS OF IMPERIALISM

In accordance with Marxian tradition, the communists think of the revolution which is to establish "proletarian dictatorship" as the inevitable outcome of economic development. The germ of the revolution lies in the contradictions of capitalistic economy—in the conflict between commodity production for profits and social needs, in the divergence between the value of labor power and the value of its product, in the antagonism between social production and private property relations. Throughout the earlier periods of capitalistic development, these contradictions gave rise to class antagonism and class

struggles which undermined the foundations of capitalism. But after 1900 both capitalism and the class struggle which it engenders assumed new forms. With the beginning of the twentieth century, capitalism became "finance capitalism," its main features becoming more and more the merging of industrial capital with bank capital, the predominance of monopoly, the growth of capital exports, and the control of the economic destinies of the world by a small "financial oligarchy." Because of that, capitalism became imperialistic, for imperialism is not a special policy of capitalism, but capitalism itself in that stage of development in which finance and monopoly, hand in hand, rule the world. Between 1900 and 1914, finance capitalism carried the world to unprecedented economic heights, but it brought on the World War and the Russian Revolution. The former marked the beginning of "the general crisis of capitalism," the beginning of its decay, while the latter laid the foundations of the "international proletarian revolution."

The death-struggle between Imperialism and Social Revolution, ushered in between 1914 and 1917, is bound to go on. The general crisis of capitalistic economy which followed in the wake of the World War cannot be overcome, because monopolistic, financial capitalism is continually widening and sharpening its inherent contradictions. Thus, while finance capitalism eliminates competition among small capitalists, it lets loose a more intense

competition among big capitalists; while it greatly stimulates the development of productive forces, it tends to retard them through price-raising and monopolistic control of markets; while it forms international cartels and combinations, it continues to foster national economic rivalries, boycotts, and tariffs; while it exports capital and develops the newer areas of the world, it plunders the colonial peoples and oppresses them politically; while it tends to bring the world closer together, it promotes "an exceptionally monstrous growth of militarism," and stirs up more wars; while it improves methods of production, it increases the exploitation of the workers; while it socializes labor in a high degree and creates the material requisites of socialism, it develops elements of parasitism and decay in capitalist society; while it places the destinies of the whole world in the hands of a few hundred billionaires and millionaires, it consolidates the organization of the working masses and intensifies their indignation against social inequality and their striving for a new social order.

Because of these growing contradictions, the stabilization effected by the bourgeoisie since 1924, cannot but be a "partial, temporary, and decaying stabilization." Permanent stabilization is impossible because the bourgeoisie "by its very nature" cannot transform a sufficient part of its profits into wages in order to expand internal markets. Regardless of improvements in processes of production

through new machinery, the use of electric power, standardization, "fordization," "rationalization."⁶ scientific management, cartels, and combinations, the share of the workers in the national income is decreasing in all countries, their standard of living is being lowered, and the "degree of their exploitation" is growing. In Germany, the workers are made to bear the burden of reparations under the Dawes Plan; in France, they are paying the costs of deflation; in England, they are bending under the weight of a declining capitalism; in other countries of Europe, they are suffering from unemployment and in one way or another are being forced to sacrifice the gains of former years; even in the United States, "the real wages of the working class have ceased to rise, working hours have practically ceased to decline, and at the same time . . . the workers are becoming more and more worn out in the process of production."

When the international situation is considered as a whole, the partial character of present-day stabilization becomes even clearer. For world economy and world politics are torn between five major conflicts. First and foremost is the division between Soviet Russia and the rest of the world—between the camp of the dictatorship of the proletariat and the camp of imperialism. This division creates a rift in world economy—a conflict between two sys-

⁶ Communists characterize "rationalization" as a system for increasing indirectly the rate of surplus-value.

tems—the system of capitalism and the system of socialism. Second in importance is the antagonism between the United States—the “Dollar Republic”—and Europe, which is especially a rivalry between American and British imperialism. Third is the reappearance of Germany as a competitor of England and France. Fourth are the antagonisms in the Pacific which primarily pit the United States against Japan; and fifth is the growing hatred of the colonial and semi-colonial countries in Asia, Africa, and Latin America against the imperialist countries.

Driven by these antagonisms, the capitalistic world is making frantic efforts to find a new equilibrium. It is trying to bolster up the League of Nations as a means of world co-operation. It is trying to mobilize the world in a war against Soviet Russia in order to destroy the symbol of world revolution. It is striving to carry out a Utopian plan of a “single world-wide state-capitalist trust” in order to organize the industry of the world as a unit.

But all these efforts of the world bourgeoisie break against the insuperable contradictions of world capitalism. What is coming is “another world war the destructiveness of which will increase parallel to the furious development of the technique of war.” The “surging development of militarism” of today, especially in the field of aviation and chemistry, is proof of the preparations which are being made for such a war and which are but poorly screened by

the "phrases and gestures of the League of Nations," by pacifist chatter, and by the Social-Democratic "mendacious babble about peace and disarmament."

While capitalist imperialism is proceeding to destruction, the world revolution is "maturing" in its midst. For the time being, "partial stabilization" is characterized by a "revolutionary lull." But this is a passing interval, merely the eve of new revolutionary upheavals. As the "first phase" of the world revolution brought the workers into power in Russia and established there a "proletarian dictatorship," so new developments of the revolution must bring the workers of other countries into power and result in the establishment of "proletarian dictatorships" in those countries.

V. THE EPOCH OF WORLD REVOLUTION

This process, however, cannot be so simple as it was once thought to be. There was a time—not so long ago—when the international socialist revolution was thought of as "a purely proletarian movement, homogeneous in composition, and almost simultaneous, when all the different elements were performing the same thing at the same time." It is now clear that, on the contrary, it is an extremely complex and uneven process, and necessarily so because it is determined by the law of capitalistic development, which is "the law of uneven development." Capitalism does not develop in all countries at the same time, in the same direction, and in the

same degree. On the contrary, the tempo of development varies from country to country, giving rise to a variety of types of capitalism and to differences in "stages of ripeness."

Because of this, the world revolution must also be a combination of processes varying in time and character. Instead of breaking out at the same time throughout the world and proceeding with the same tempo in all countries, the social revolution follows an uneven line. One day, it may develop in a country of mature capitalism; another day, it may flare up at the other end of the globe in the colonies; the next day, it may break out in a comparatively backward country. Necessarily, it cannot consist of purely proletarian revolutions in advanced capitalist countries; it must include also national wars for freedom, colonial insurrections, and revolutionary movements in semi-colonial countries. While the main nucleus of the world revolution are the proletarian uprisings, the others, especially the colonial uprisings, are important because they shatter the structure of world imperialism and hasten its ultimate collapse.

This means that the world revolution must also be thought of as a "prolonged process," in fact, as a "whole, great, historical epoch." How many decades or generations this may mean cannot be definitely stated. It also means that for an indefinite time, the world will present the spectacle of conflicting ideas and economic systems existing side by

side. As the workers gain power in one or another country, they will have to establish various political and economic forms. As a result, there will exist side by side capitalistic and socialistic countries of various types, and wars and struggles will take place between them. Only after the workers in the "decisive centers of capitalistic power" will have won their fight will they be able to combine their forces, establish a "world dictatorship,"—a World Union of Socialist Soviet Republics—and begin the systematic reconstruction of world economy on a socialist basis. That will mark the "completion of the world revolution."

Though heterogeneous and complex in its developments, the international proletarian revolution retains a basic unity, owing to the existing proletarian dictatorship in the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics—the U. S. S. R.⁷ The U. S. S. R. stimulates the workers of other countries to capture power; it supports the revolutionary movements in the colonies and guides them in a socialist direction; it points the way to all the oppressed classes of the world, holding high for them the beacon-light of a new culture based on Marxism and on the value of labor.

For these reasons, the U. S. S. R. is the center of the world revolution and the "only fatherland of the international proletariat." Workers in all countries must do everything in their power to help in the construction of socialism in Russia and to defend

⁷ The name for Russia adopted in 1924.

Russia against attacks. The capitalist states are torn between the desire to trade with Russia and their fear of the growth of Russia which signifies "the growth of international revolution." There is constant danger of a combination of the imperialist powers against the U. S. S. R., and the next world war may, in fact, be an alignment of the imperialist world against the U. S. S. R. It is the duty of the international proletariat to undermine the armies of their respective countries—by propaganda, desertion, fraternization, and general strikes—in order to assure the triumph of their common "socialist fatherland." Such anti-militarist activities are the only effective method to prevent war, and in case war comes, are sure to advance the final victory of world socialism and of the world proletariat.

VI. THE COMMUNIST TASK

It is the task of the communists to carry on a "theoretical and practical struggle" for the dictatorship of the proletariat, and for the violent conquest of power by the workers. In this task the communists see their distinction not only from all reformist elements, but also from the socialists. But as the revolutionary process is uneven, the direct struggle for the conquest of power can be carried on only in the advanced industrial countries such as England, Germany, France, the United States. In countries of "medium capitalist development," it is necessary to fight for democratic rights and for agrarian revolutions. In colonial and semi-colonial countries, the

struggle must be also for national independence and against feudalism. Even in the countries of highly developed capitalism, when the "tides of revolution are not flowing," it is necessary for the communists to concern themselves with the daily needs of the workers and with improvements in their condition under capitalism. But even then, the communists must use methods which will develop the revolutionary spirit of the workers.

In their efforts to stem the tides of revolution, the capitalists have recourse to the method of "divide and rule." In the principal countries, they share some of their profits and of their "plunder" with small sections of the skilled workers and employees, allowing the latter relatively high wages and high standards of living. The representatives of these corrupted elements of labor are the reformist trade unions and especially the social democrats—the "greatest enemies of the world revolution." Bribed by the capitalists, the social democrats tell the workers that the capitalist system still has good prospects of prosperity ahead and that the conflicts of capitalist diplomacy may be overcome through the growth of the League of Nations. As these ideas have a hold on large masses of the workers, the communists must fight the social democrats and the "reformist" labor leaders as much as the capitalists, in order to "capture the mass organizations of the proletariat" and to prepare the broad masses of the workers for the coming revolutionary battles.

CHAPTER XXI

THE THIRD INTERNATIONAL AND ITS SATELLITES

When the communists started on their career in 1919, their idea was to gather political parties, trade unions and other labor groups under the banner of one all-inclusive organization—the Third International. But they quickly gave up the idea as impracticable and began setting up special organizations for specific activities. So that today the communist challenge is embodied in a number of international bodies which form a closely knit system, combining division of labor with unity of purpose. In the center of the system is the Third International, giving aim and direction to the separate organizations and co-ordinating their performances into a general campaign.

I. COMMUNIST POLITICS

In structure and functions, the Third International¹ is an international political association. Its constituent elements are the political communist parties which now exist—legally or illegally—in over

¹ In communist circles, the Third International is popularly called the Comintern which is an abbreviation of Communist International.

50 countries, there being one communist party for each country. The individual members of these parties are men and women who accept the program and principles of communism, pledge themselves to work actively on their behalf, submit to communist discipline, and who pay dues which vary in amount from country to country.

In those countries where they are prohibited by law, the communist parties carry on their work underground. In all other countries, while engaging in some illegal activities, they are legal political parties—publish newspapers, hold public meetings, participate in political campaigns, send representatives to municipal, state, and national legislative bodies, and openly propagate their ideas of social revolution.

1. Cells and Centralism

In accordance with the principles of "bolshevization,"² the unit of a communist party is a group of people who work in the same place,—factory, mine, office, store, farm, or some other enterprise. Such a group forms a "cell," and every member of the communist party of a country must be inscribed in some such "cell." In addition to "industrial cells," there are also "street cells" which unite communists living in the same neighborhood. The "cells" are the meeting places where all questions of the communist movement come before the rank and file of

² See Chapter XIII, p. 313.

the membership. There are wide differences in the different countries in the extent to which this "cell" organization has been put into operation, the communist parties of some countries still remaining on a basis of residential membership.

Factory and street cells are combined to form larger local and district organizations which in their turn make up the national party. With minor variations, all communist parties are governed by a central executive committee which is elected at a national conference of delegates. The central executive committee, however, meets only a few times during the year, and power is vested in a smaller body composed of five or seven members and known as the Political Bureau, or Politburo.

In their internal relations, the communist parties are built on the principle of "democratic centralism." Every organ of the party must carry out promptly and accurately the decisions and orders of the officials higher up, and every individual member of the party must submit to "iron discipline." Before a decision has been taken by the party, the members are free to discuss the issue at "cell" meetings and in party circles. But once a decision has been made by the party through its directing organs, every member of the party must submit to it unconditionally. No communists are allowed, individually or in groups, to oppose themselves to the party as a whole—"fractions," and "groupings" being a violation of fundamental "leninist" principles. The

effect of these arrangements is to concentrate the power of decision and of execution in the Politburo of each communist party.

While regarded as a general principle of communism, "democratic centralism" is advocated also for special practical reasons. Some of the communist activities, such as agitation in the army and navy, are of a secret character and must be known only to a few. Centralized control also enables a communist party to become illegal, whenever it is forced to do so by sudden political developments.

2. E. C. C. I. and Praesidium

Each national communist party is a "section" of the Third International. The relationship, however, is not that of a federative association, as in the case of the Socialist International, but that of a unified and centralized political combination. The Third International is conceived as a "monolith hewn out of a single block," a "world party" in which the separate communist parties are not autonomous members, but subordinate parts governed by the same principles of "democratic centralism" which prevail within separate sections.

Accordingly, the Third International extends on a world scale the basic arrangements of the separate communist parties. The "supreme organ" of the Third International is a "world congress" which is supposed to meet every two years, but which has

met at call.³ The world congress examines all questions of theory, policy, and organization, acting as the general directing body unifying communist doctrine and tactics. It elects all the executive organs of the International, and is the court of appeals to which any member or group or an entire party may bring complaints and ask for a hearing.

The world congress is an assembly of delegates from the communist parties and allied organizations of the different countries. But representation and voting are *sui generis*. The number of delegates which each communist party may send to the congress is fixed by the executive committee of the International, while the number of votes allowed is fixed by the congress itself, on the basis of membership and of political importance. No mandates are allowed, and any votes cast by delegates of any country in accordance with secret mandates are null and void. These congresses are held behind closed doors, their lengthy and at times violent debates being reported in the communist press in more or less expurgated form.⁴

Between congresses, the Third International is governed by an executive committee which is usually designated by the letters E. C. C. I.⁵ The com-

³ The six congresses of the Third International were held in 1919, 1920, 1921, 1922, 1924, and 1928.

⁴ The congress of 1928 was composed of 515 delegates from 58 sections.

⁵ Executive Committee of the Communist International. The E. C. C. I. elected by the congress of 1928 is composed of 58

munist parties of the different countries are arranged in groups, and each group is allowed one or more delegates on the committee. In selecting these delegates, each country or group of countries may put up candidates, but cannot insist on their election, the latter being subject to the decision of the congress.

In accordance with the principle of "democratic centralism," the E. C. C. I. has the power to issue "imperative instructions" to its sections and to exercise control over their activities. It may annul or amend any decision adopted by the executive committees or by the congress of any communist party; it may refuse to ratify the program of any section; it may issue obligatory orders, and may expel individuals, groups or whole parties for violation of communist principles and policies.

Obversely, the executive committees of the communist parties in the different countries are accountable to the Executive Committee of the International. They must make regular and detailed reports of all their activities to this executive committee; must remit to it dues as fixed; must obtain its approval for the calling of their national congresses. No member of any executive committee of any section has the right to resign his post without the consent of the E. C. C. I. Each official position in the Third International "belongs to the International" and not to the temporary occupant, members and 42 candidates. See *International Press Correspondence* for November 21, 1928.

and he who deserts such post is "guilty of disrupting the communist movement."

Besides the sessions of the E. C. C. I., which must take place at least once every six months, there is held twice a year an Enlarged Plenum of the Executive Committee. This is composed of the members of the E. C. C. I. and of delegates from the various communist parties whose number is fixed by the Executive Committee. In the last few years, it has usually consisted of from a hundred to two hundred delegates. The Enlarged Plenum has none of the powers of the world congress, but its resolutions serve as a guide to the communist parties and to the International, pending the decisions of a congress.

Between the sessions of the Executive Committee, the affairs of the Third International are in the hands of a Praesidium elected by the Executive Committee. The Praesidium consists of 30 members and nine candidates, and meets in Moscow, the headquarters of the International, every two weeks.⁹ It elects a "political secretariat" of eleven members and three candidates who reside in Moscow and who direct the work of the Third International. The work is departmentalized. There are eleven "national secretariats," an International Women's Secretariat, a division for Organization, or Org-

⁹ From 1919 to 1926, the Praesidium had a chairman who was at the same time president of the Third International. In the fall of 1926 this office, filled by Zinoviev, was abolished. See Chapter XIV, pp. 351-352.

bureau, a division of Information and Statistics, a division of Propaganda and Agitation, a division of the Orient, and several others.⁷

3. Sections and World Party

At present, as during its entire career, the Third International has its base in Russia. Of its total membership of 1,707,769,⁸ over 1,200,000, or nearly three-fourths, are in Russia. The Russian Communist Party has an elaborate party machinery and large funds, and is the ruling party of a great empire with vast potential economic resources, and large powers for influencing the course of world politics.

Outside of Russia, the Third International has its largest following in Germany, Czechoslovakia, and France. Of the 500,000 non-Russian communists, over 300,000, or 40 per cent, and most of the communist votes cast, are in these three countries.⁹ The communist parties in these countries have large offices, housed in buildings owned by them, big publishing houses, daily, weekly, and monthly periodicals with large circulations, and hundreds of em-

⁷ The Secretariat and offices of the Third International are housed in Moscow.

⁸ As of January 1, 1928. The congress of the Third International in September, 1928, invited 66 parties and organizations with a membership of 4,024,159. Of these members, 1,798,859 belonged to communist parties and sympathizing organizations; 2,225,300 belonged to the Communist Youth Leagues.

⁹ In 1928, the communists polled 3,232,000 votes in Germany and 1,060,000 in France.

ployees in charge of the various divisions and sections of their organizations.

The other sections of the Third International present a spotty picture. Through Spain, Italy, Hungary, and the Balkans to Poland and the Baltic States, they are illegal or semi-illegal parties. With the exception of Poland, the communist parties in these countries are small conspirative organizations, having been almost destroyed since 1923 as a result of government persecutions. In the countries bordering on Central Europe, the communists have been unable to make much headway against the solid socialist organizations. In Austria, Switzerland, Holland, Denmark, Belgium, the communists are small agitational groups of a few hundred members each. In Sweden and Norway, they form small minorities of a few thousand members. The same is true of England, where the membership of the communist party is about nine thousand. Outside of Europe, the largest communist parties are those of China, which is semi-illegal now, and of the United States known as the Workers' Party, whose membership is about 12,000.

Owing to differences in strength and in political and economic conditions, the sections of the Third International show a great variety in character and activities. In Denmark, Austria, Holland, Belgium, the communists are confined to verbal agitation and propaganda. In Germany, France, Czechoslovakia, they give much of their energy to parliamentary

THE THIRD INTERNATIONAL

I. Membership of Communist Parties ^a

Country	1927	1926	1924
TOTAL.....	^b	^b	1,222,035
Soviet Russia.....	1,210,954	1,078,185	446,089
Germany.....	124,729	134,248	121,394
Czechoslovakia.....	150,000	92,818	138,996
France.....	52,376	75,000	68,187
United States.....	12,000	11,990	17,000
Sweden.....	15,479	10,849	7,011
England.....	9,000	6,000	4,000

II. Income Account of the Executive Committee for 1927 ^c

RECEIPTS

		Roubles
Balance on hand on Jan. 1, 1927.....		16,819.62
Membership dues, received from 44 sections of the Comintern for 1,707,769 members.....	1,029,367.18	
Collections and donations.....	176,679.80	
Received from publishing houses, telegraphic agencies and the press bulletin information.....	152,128.00	1,358,174.98
TOTAL RECEIPTS.....		1,374,994.60 ^d

EXPENDITURES

Administrative expenditures (salaries, office expenses, etc.).....	595,059.04
Post and telegraph expenses.....	33,750.00
Travelling expenses.....	51,286.75
Subsidies for party press, publishing houses, cultural work (schools, circles, clubs, etc.) of 17 sections...	690,206.85
TOTAL EXPENDITURES.....	1,370,302.46
Balance on January 1, 1928.....	4,691.96

^a The incomplete data in this table are published by the Third International in the report to the sixth congress (in Russian); ¹ complete statistics of membership are lacking.

^b Not available.

^c Published in the *International Press Correspondence* for March 15, 1928.

^d About \$701,247.

work. In France—also in England—the communists carry on an active anti-militarist campaign through secret work in the army and navy. In Poland, Italy, the Baltic States, and in the Balkans, the activities of the communists resemble the work of the Russian Bolsheviki under the Czar; they organize secret societies, have secret printing plants, publish illegal leaflets and pamphlets, maintain secret contacts with workers in the factories, preparing for mass demonstrations and revolution. In Asia, Africa, and Latin America, they are active in the nationalistic, agrarian, and “anti-imperialist” movements.

4. Discipline and Finances

To weld its sections into a “world party,” the Third International relies on propaganda, discipline, and finances. The concept of world revolution is a bridge across the frontiers of national issues and interests. In its name, communists in all countries are urged to rise above national limits, to look at their own country as part of a world system, and to see world events from the point of view of an antagonism between a world-bourgeoisie and a world-proletariat. The magazines and journals of the Third International devote much space to surveys of world economics and world politics, which all communists are urged to read and study, and all sections are required to follow developments in the Third International as a whole, and to pass

judgment on each other's activities. This factor is reinforced by the symbolism of Soviet Russia, which is held up as the living example of what the communists may attain in their own countries.

Propaganda is greatly helped by personal contacts. Moscow is the meeting place of communists, "revolutionists," "anti-imperialists," militant trade unionists, and political and social radicals in general from the four corners of the globe. Leading communists from everywhere are continuously streaming into Moscow—to attend official committees of one kind or another, to report on affairs at home to the E. C. C. I., or to take counsel with its leaders.

Communists have a sense of self-discipline which has been but rarely paralleled in history. Few communists are ever induced by friendship or by other considerations to reveal what is happening at the closed meetings of their organizations, no matter how unimportant these may be. Such sense of discipline is fostered by the contempt of the communists for the "bourgeois" world and by their feeling that they are a fighting fraternity surrounded by enemies.

But where and when this sense of self-discipline fails, the Third International does not hesitate to use disciplinary powers. How effective these may be was shown by the treatment of Trotsky, Zinoviev, Kamenev, Radek, Rakovsky, Paul Levi, Ruth Fischer, Boris Souvarine, and others who at one time or another had been among the arbiters of the

communist world. In a less dramatic way, these powers are exercised all the time over individuals and groups in one country or another, in the form of reprimands, demotions from responsible positions, suspensions, and expulsions. Communists who are suspected of "deviations" or of activities contrary to official decisions, are watched by trusted men of the E. C. C. I. and are liable to be called to account at any time.¹⁰

Financially, the Third International does more than any other International to hold its constituent elements together. In 1927, the Third International, according to its report,¹¹ spent about \$345,000 or over 50 per cent of its total receipts, in subsidies to 17 of its sections, for newspapers, pamphlets, organizing, and "cultural" work.

II. COMMUNIST TRADE UNIONISM

To the communist, the political organization is of first and foremost importance. He regards politics as "concentrated economics," the class struggle as a political struggle, the dictatorship of the proletariat as a political process, and the party as the instrument of the social revolution. It is, therefore, his primary duty in all countries to help build

¹⁰ During the fight against the "Opposition," the Communist Party of Russia used the secret police of Soviet Russia (the Ogpu) to ferret out its opponents. Outside of Russia, members of the "Opposition" were spied upon by agents of the E. C. C. I.

¹¹ This is the first financial statement published by the Third International since its organization. See *International Press Correspondence* for March 15, 1928.

strong communist parties as a basis for a powerful and unified International.

A political party, however, can have only a limited membership. In the communist party, membership is especially limited by processes of selection, discipline, methods of work, risks and discomforts. But to carry through the social revolution, it is necessary to have the support of the majority of the working population; if not of a "statistical majority," at least of a majority of the organized workers interested in collective action.

Of the mass-organizations now in existence, the communists attach prime importance to the trade unions as peculiarly fit instruments for their purposes. The trade unions bring to the workers the first consciousness of class-interests; in a revolutionary struggle, they can supply fighting troops and help in taking over the means of production, "expropriate the expropriators." After the conquest of power, during the dictatorship of the proletariat, they can help in reorganizing production on socialist lines.

1. The R. I. L. U. or Profintern

For these reasons, the communists since 1921 have been urged to pay their utmost attention to "work in the trade unions." In all countries, they have been told to "be at the head of the trade unions, to direct them, to make of them a field of communist activity, an instrument of class struggle, in order

that the millions of workers who have not as yet come to an understanding of communism may come to it." The Red International of Labor Unions was created to co-ordinate and promote these activities on an international scale.¹²

According to the original plan, the communists were to penetrate the "reformist" trade unions of "Amsterdam," defeat the non-communist leaders, and become the elected officials. Trade unions and national centers, thus "captured," were to join with syndicalist and other militant trade unions in the R. I. L. U., which was to become a "revolutionary" international labor organization under communist guidance.

Since its inception, however, this plan has been upset in various ways. The officials of the "reformist" unions expelled the communist leaders from their unions. National centers and International Trade Secretariats refused to admit to membership unions under communist control. The syndicalists rebelled against communist guidance. On the other hand, the communists carried their campaigns for control to points where no choice was left them but to claim a majority and to split the unions.

As a result, the R. I. L. U. has today a varied membership—national centers, local and industrial unions, associations of "partisans," "minority" organizations such as the National Minority Move-

¹² The R. I. L. U. is known also as the Profintern which is the Russian abbreviation for trade union International.

ment in England and the Trade Union Educational League in the United States. It also includes 15 international "propaganda committees" for agitation in the International Trade Secretariats, and such bodies as the Pan-Pacific Secretariat and the Latin-American Trade Union Secretariat.

As a central body, the R. I. L. U. carries on its work through a congress, a central council, an executive committee, and a secretariat. The congress elaborates not only the general program, but specific applications of it to different countries. The congress elects a Central Council which in its turn elects the Executive Bureau ¹³ and the general secretary. Since 1920, A. Losovsky has been in charge of the secretariat which has its headquarters in Moscow—in the Palace of Labor ¹⁴—and which employs a considerable staff on organizational work, informational and statistical services, translation, library, editing the monthly journal of the R. I. L. U., archives, international contacts. The secretaries of the 15 International Propaganda Committees, Russians located in Moscow, attend the meetings of the Executive Bureau, not only "regarding the questions pertaining to their industries, but also for all questions of the international labor movement."

¹³ At the fourth congress of the R. I. L. U., the Central Council was constituted of 94 members from 28 countries, the colonies, Latin America and related organizations. To the Executive Bureau 21 members were elected.

¹⁴ The Palace of Labor is an immense building which houses the central committees of the trade unions of Russia.

2. Strike Strategy

No attempt is made by the communists to hide the communistic purpose of the R. I. L. U. "The objectives pursued by the R. I. L. U.," writes the secretary, "are essentially the same as those of the Communist International. . . . Only the methods are different to suit the special character of the trade union movement."¹⁵ As the trade unions are concerned with immediate improvements in the life of the workers, the communists and other followers of the R. I. L. U. must do the same, and take part in "all the details of the daily struggles" even for the "most meager improvements." They must make use of the ordinary devices of trade unionism—strikes, boycotts, collective bargaining, and the rest.

Regardless of such procedure, the R. I. L. U. claims that there remains a basic difference between the "reformist" trade unionism of "Amsterdam" and its own "revolutionary" trade unionism. The dif-

¹⁵ Losovsky, *op. cit.*, p. 233. Before 1928, the congresses of the R. I. L. U. were held immediately after the congresses of the Communist International. At the latter, a trade union committee was appointed which made a report and submitted a resolution or "thesis" on the trade union question. After it had been adopted by the congress of the Communist International, it became the basis of discussion and of the resolutions adopted by the congress of the R. I. L. U. In 1928, the fourth congress of the R. I. L. U. was held soon after the Ninth Enlarged Plenum of the E. C. C. I., but the same procedure was followed. Losovsky, the general secretary of the R. I. L. U., is a member of the Executive Committee of the Communist International.

ference rests on the fact that the communists and the R. I. L. U. "connect the day-to-day struggles of the workers with the ultimate aim." Such difference in outlook leads to differences in strategy. While the "reformists" try to obtain concessions for the workers without a fight, the communists know and tell the workers that nothing can be gained without a struggle. While the reformists stress the sanctity of collective contracts, the communists regard the wage agreement as a "temporary armistice" whose purpose it is to give the workers a chance to consolidate their forces for further struggles. Long term agreements are denounced as tending to weaken the fighting capacity of the workers. For similar reasons, the communists are opposed to compulsory arbitration, employer-employee partnerships, and to all schemes of "industrial peace" and "class collaboration," and emphasize instead the principles of class antagonism and class struggle. In accordance with these principles, the communists are always for more vigorous action in the unions. They are ready at any moment to advance more radical demands than the "reformists" and to intensify the struggle for such demands.

Necessarily, the communists are bound to come into conflict with the "reformist" leaders, especially during strikes. The reformists, according to the communists, are renouncing more and more all fighting policies, and becoming in fact "open strike breaking agencies," and the followers of the R. I. L. U. are

exhorted to drive these "strike breakers" and "spies and allies of the capitalists" out of the unions. The communists are told not to "take too much into account formalities or the right of the bureaucrats." Every strike should be made to serve as an arena of struggle for leadership between the communists and the "reformists." As soon as a strike breaks out, the communists must demand the election of a special strike committee, of a council of action, or of a "unity committee" in which they can exercise leadership exclusively, or jointly with the "reformists."

3. Nuclei and Dual Unions

As long as the Third International based its strategy on the idea of the "united front" and of "international trade unity,"¹⁶ it emphatically warned its members against breaking up the reformist trade unions. Instead, the communists were urged to join the unions in the trades in which they worked and to form "cells" or "trade union nuclei" for the purpose of carrying out the trade union policy of the communist parties.

With the shift in communist policy, beginning early in 1928,¹⁷ emphasis is now not on the "united front" or "unity," but on the extension of communist control. "Cells" and "fractions" are to be continued, especially in those countries and in those industries where the "reformist" trade unions are

¹⁶ See Chapters X and XIII.

¹⁷ See Chapter XV, pp. 383-384.

solidly organized, as in Germany and England. But where communist dual unions already exist, as in France and in Czechoslovakia, or where the old trade unions are alleged to be in process of disintegration, as in the United States, and in industries which are still unorganized, the communists are now to organize their own unions, in opposition to the "reformist" trade unions.

4. Claims and Computations

It is difficult to say what the membership of the R. I. L. U. is. Since its origin, the R. I. L. U. has indulged in loose computations. At present, it claims a following of 17 million in 50 countries which it divides into three groups: affiliated organizations, independent sympathizing unions which cannot affiliate because of political conditions, and "revolutionary minorities" in other organizations.¹⁸ On the basis of this computation, the R. I. L. U. claims to be larger than "Amsterdam" and more international in scope and influence.

However, outside of Russia, the R. I. L. U. may be said to have a membership only in France, Czechoslovakia, and China. Even in these countries its affiliated organizations are not a source of much strength. The real prop of the R. I. L. U. is the

¹⁸ Of this number, 10,248,000 are in Russia; 525,000 in France; 196,000 in Czechoslovakia; 2,280,000 are claimed for China. About 2,875,000 are described as "revolutionary minorities" in 30 countries, while 368,000 are said to be in organizations which cannot affiliate because of political reasons. See *L'Internationale Syndicale Rouge*, March, 1928.

All-Russian Trade Union Council with its present membership of eleven millions.¹⁹

In general, the R. I. L. U. is a loose-jointed organization. Its contacts with its affiliated bodies and with its "cells" in various countries are not very close. It has but little influence with the non-Russian communists who are inclined to look directly to the Third International for guidance also in trade union matters. The secretariat of the R. I. L. U. is morally and materially dependent on the Third International and on the Russian trade unions. In practice, the R. I. L. U. is thus more in the nature of an agitational center than of a trade union organization.

III. AUXILIARIES

1. Farmers and Women

Operating in a different sphere is the International Peasants' Council, in existence since October, 1923. Its function is to harness the wagon of the peasants and farmers in all countries to the star of social revolution. To this end, the communists are instructed to take part in the struggles of the

¹⁹ Pravda, December 14, 1928. The R. I. L. U. publishes no financial statements. It is generally accepted that its support comes from the Russian trade unions. The latter also make appropriations for aid to workers in other countries, sometimes sending it though the R. I. L. U., sometimes direct. From January 1, 1924, to December 1, 1926, the Russian trade unions sent abroad about \$221,600 to workers in 22 countries (exclusive of aid to the British miners in 1926); of this amount over \$89,733 was sent to China. See *La Vie Ouvrière*, November 26, 1926.

agricultural population: to encourage peasants' movements for the redistribution of land, movements against high land taxes, and colonial movements against the exactions of the home countries. Communist "cells" are formed within farmers' organizations in order to gain control of them. Wherever that is impossible, the communists try to split off the poor peasants and to organize them into independent political parties. Everywhere the attempt is made to get the peasants' and farmers' organizations to join the International Peasants' Council.

At present, the International Peasants' Council is a central body directing the activities of "communist cells" and of small peasant parties in a few countries. It holds conferences and congresses, in conjunction with the meetings of the Communist International. A Central Executive Committee is its executive organ, and a Praesidium carries on the work from headquarters in Moscow, where it also supports an Agrarian Institute for the study of agricultural problems.

Peasants and workers have wives, daughters, sisters. In the communist scheme of revolution, these "female masses" have definite functions to perform. Lenin said that the "proletarian revolution cannot win unless the millions of working women take part in the struggle." On the day after the revolution, nothing can be done towards socialist reconstruction without the help of the women. The communists

must, therefore, "capture the women" and transform them into "conscious combatants for social revolution."

To this end, every communist cell—whether in factory, trade union, labor party, parents' council, tenants' association, or war veterans' association—must have a man or woman assigned to special work among women. The central committee of every communist party must have a woman's section, with at least one secretary, to direct the work. The International Women's Secretariat, with headquarters in Moscow, promotes the work internationally; holds semi-annual conferences, publishes special pamphlets and journals, and keeps in touch with the national secretaries of the women's sections. The Secretariat has a special division for the Orient whose task it is to help the women of the Orient to fight against "religious and moral prejudices." March 8th is communist International Women's Day, and a special program is staged on that day for propaganda among women.

A connecting link between trade unions, farmers' societies, and women's organizations are the co-operative societies. Everything must be done to weed out "reformism" in the co-operatives and to bring them under the control of the communists. All communists must be members of co-operative societies, and must form "cells" within them. International co-operative conferences are held by the communists to co-ordinate their work in the existing

co-operative societies. Their main task at present is to drive a wedge between the International Co-operative Alliance and the Socialist International and to establish their own influence in the former.

2. The Youth

Intimately connected with the Third International is the Communist Youth International, whose members are young people between the ages of 14 and 20. The C. Y. I. is composed of national sections—Communist Youth Leagues—whose local branches are made up of “cells” in factories, trade unions, streets, and elsewhere. It is also built on the principles of “democratic centralism” and is governed by a hierarchy of local, district, and national committees which all head up in the Central Executive Committee and Executive Bureau in Moscow. In every country, the Communist Youth League is under the direction of the communist party, and the Communist Youth International in its entirety forms an integral part of the Third International, has all the rights of a section of the latter, and is subject to the orders of the E. C. C. I.

The task of the C. Y. I. is to organize young men and women of the working population who will form the recruiting *cadres* for the communist parties. Through the C. Y. I. the working youth is expected to become familiar with general communist doctrines, and to be inaugurated into communist

methods of agitation, propaganda, and political activity.

Several special tasks are assigned to the Communist Youth Leagues. The members of these Leagues must acquire a "military education" under the direction of the communist parties, as a preparation for revolution. They are expected to form "cells" in the "bourgeois armies," and in co-operation with the red trade unions, undermine militarist discipline. It is their duty to carry on "anti-religious campaigns" among young people. And they must do everything in their power to "destroy" all rival organizations of young people, such as the fascist, socialist, and religious youth leagues. Whenever necessary, the communist youth leagues must be ready to reorganize on an "illegal basis" to carry on their work underground.

Within the C. Y. I., there is an International Children's Bureau which supervises the work of the Children's Leagues, composed of children under 14 years of age. The Children's Leagues are urged to form "communist children's unions" in all countries, under the leadership of the Youth Leagues, to found "cells" in the public schools, to oppose child labor, to fight against corporal punishment in the schools, and to agitate against war. An International Children's Week is held as a means of promoting their work.

In Russia, the C. Y. I. is a large organization with a membership of over 2,000,000, and plays

an important part in the communist scheme of control. Outside of Russia, its membership and influence are small.²⁰

Similar to the work of the Communist Youth International is that of the Red Sports International. The theory upon which this International proceeds is that the "physical training of the workers is an essential feature of the revolutionary struggle" and that under a proletarian dictatorship, sport is an effective means for training the young people to be good citizens of the "proletarian state." The particular tasks which the Red Sports International sets itself today is to detach young workers and peasants from the "bourgeois" and socialist sport organizations. The Red Sports societies are also expected to co-operate with the Youth Leagues in exercising a "revolutionary influence" in the armies of the capitalistic countries and to form "proletarian defense corps" such as the Red Front Guards of Germany. The tactics to be used are the same as in all other communist undertakings. The communists must form "opposition groups" within bourgeois sport organizations, and "cells" in workers' sport societies. The organization of the Red Sports International parallels that of the Com-

²⁰ In the ten countries for which figures are available, the membership in 1928 was 69,252. Of this number 20,183 were in Germany; 14,500 in Sweden; 12,789 in Czechoslovakia; 10,500 in France; 2,480 in the United States; 1,400 in England. See *Four Years of the Communist Youth International* (in Russian), Moscow, 1928, p. 120.

munist Youth International, and is managed by an Executive Committee and a Praesidium with headquarters in Moscow.

3. Red Aid

Among the several organizations which work with the communists, the International Workers' Relief and the International Red Aid may be mentioned. The International Workers' Relief was organized in 1921 to aid the victims of the Russian famine. Its function now is to aid workers in any emergency. It collected some \$10,000,000 from 1921 to 1926 which it used for the relief of workers and peasants in Russia, in Germany in 1923, in China in 1925, in England during the strike of 1926, and elsewhere.²¹ The International Red Aid works "in the rear of the proletarian army" and its task is to give "material, moral, and legal aid to revolutionists in prison, their families and children, as well as to the families of revolutionists who have lost their lives." Between 1923 and 1926, the Red Aid spent \$2,695,000 in its various activities.²²

Both the International Workers' Relief and the International Red Aid claim to be non-partisan organizations.²³ They both have a mixed membership, composed of local groups and branches, of

²¹ See *Arbeiter-Hilfe*, for September, 1926.

²² *Pravda*, March 18, 1927.

²³ This is denied by the socialists who say that both organizations are definitely communistic. See *Quelques Documents sur Le Secours Ouvrier International*, published by the Belgian Labor Party in 1926.

trade union sections, of shop committees, and of various other associations. Both organizations hold international conferences at which their executive committees and executive bureaus are elected. The offices of the International Workers' Relief are in Berlin; those of the International Red Aid are in Moscow.

Both organizations are actively supported by communists not only for the aid which they render to workers, but also for the opportunity which they offer for spreading communist influence. The work of the International Workers' Relief appeals to the human sympathies not only of workers, but of large sections of the middle classes, while the work of the International Red Aid finds response in the hearts of liberal men and women whose sense of justice is outraged by the procedure of undemocratic governments. All communists are instructed to promote these two organizations, to organize local branches for them, to urge members to pay dues, and to lend them every possible support. March 18 is set aside by the communists as International Red Aid Day.

IV. ACHILLES' HEEL

1. Human, all too Human

In its effort to develop a world revolutionary party, the Third International comes up against internal difficulties which arise from the nature of its work, its form of organization, national differ-

ences, and from its special relationship to Russia. In general, the communist parties impose upon the average communist a load of activity which is much beyond his powers. The individual communist is expected to belong to a "cell" of the party, to be a member of a trade union, of a co-operative, of a shop committee, a sport society, a workers' defense corps, of a branch of the Workers' Relief and of the Red Aid, and of other organizations in which it is important for the communist party to gain influence. In every organization he is expected to be "active," to study the problems with which that organization is confronted, and to spare no time or energy in promoting communist policies.

True, the individual communist gets his cues from the party which, in its turn, receives instructions and slogans from the Third International. But though processes of thinking are simplified, the communist leaders find it difficult to get the work done, as they would like it. At the meetings of the Third International and of its allied organizations, the "defects" and shortcomings of the work of the communists in different countries are listed under numerous headings.

What has been noted with regard to the individual communist is repeated on a larger scale in the relations between the communist parties and the Third International. The various communist parties cannot do all that is expected of them in the way of sending in reports, of delegating their best men to

the sessions of the E. C. C. I., and of taking part in the solution of international problems. In various degrees, they limp in their efforts to keep up with the procession of communist activities, and neglect one or more phases of it. They either fall behind in their trade union work, or fail to give proper support to the Youth Leagues, or they misunderstand the policy of the "United Front," or lag behind in reorganizing themselves on the basis of "factory cells."

Neither does the E. C. C. I. itself find the task of directing its sections an easy one; it lacks the necessary intellectual and material resources. Only a few of its leaders are versed in Marxist doctrines, and can follow world developments. In formulating doctrines and policies, these leaders have to depend on inadequate information, and on second-hand reports of second-rate men. Inevitably they find themselves misjudging situations, making "errors," and giving wrong directions.

2. Capturing and Holding

Owing to the nature of their propaganda and procedure, many of the communist organizations tend to be unstable. In the parliaments of Europe, the communist parties pursue largely policies of criticism and obstruction, denouncing bills advocated in the interests of labor, on the grounds that the provisions of such bills are inadequate, and attacking the foreign policy of their respective countries. Because

of this, they thrive in moments of political tension, drawing new followers from the ranks of discontented socialists, trade unionists, and radicals. But as soon as such tension has passed, many of these elements drift away or return to their former camps. The communist parties in all countries, outside of Russia, show a high turn-over in membership and marked fluctuations in influence.

Even greater are the difficulties of the communists in the trade union field. Inevitably, owing to their general outlook, many communists are not primarily interested in trade union work.²⁴ It is a task imposed upon them which they tend to neglect, drifting in and out of the unions, in accordance with the special needs of the communist parties.

When active in a union, the communists are less concerned with the immediate needs of the organization than with "capturing" and "revolutionizing" the workers. It is inevitable that they should be less inclined to consider the practicability of their demands, or the chances of success. They are often ready to advance demands, regardless of what the industry can bear, or to prolong strikes even when victory for the workers is problematical. The Third International, since its Ninth Plenum in February,

²⁴ Of the 515 delegates to the 1928 congress of the Third International, 73 were not members of trade unions. The reporter of the credentials commission complained that in many countries from 20 to 40 per cent of the members do not belong to their trade unions. See *International Press Correspondence*, November 21, 1928.

1928, has warned its followers that a "good communist" does not have to advocate strikes at all times, that the "slogan of the general strike" must not be abused, and that the communists, while "not dragging at the tail of the masses, must not run too far ahead of them." But these warnings do not always have the desired effect. In consequence, communists and their sympathizers, even upon "capturing" a union or a strike, find themselves often in possession of a husk whose kernel they had themselves helped to destroy.

On the other hand, wherever the communists succeed in avoiding such destruction, they do so at the cost of their main ends. For the logic of trade unionism demands attention to the daily needs of the workers by methods which are inherent in its own structure. Communists fail to devise schemes and methods for the administration of trade unions which are different from those of the "reformists" and their trade unions become similar in character to those of non-communists, as is illustrated by the experience of the communist unions in France, Czechoslovakia, and the United States.

3. "Orders from Moscow"

Neither can the Third International escape difficulties arising from national differences. Regardless of their theories, the communist parties are sensitive to national contacts and resist the centralizing uniformity of the Third International. As political

and economic issues differ from country to country, the communists tend to become absorbed in their domestic problems and to emphasize national points of view as against the general consideration of world revolution.

National stresses are also created by the dominance of the Russian Communist Party in the Third International. In matters of theory, the Russian communists, while sanctifying Marx,²⁵ put Lenin more and more in the foreground. In discussions of current issues, the appeal is overwhelmingly to the authority of Lenin and Leninism. In matters of organization, the Bolshevik Party is held up as a model for all communist parties to study and to emulate. In the formulation of policies and tactics, the Russians give the tone. At the congresses of the Third International they head the important committees, present the leading reports, spin the theories, and make the slogans. In the E. C. C. I. they steer the wheels. Though resolutions have been adopted to attract non-Russian communists to the leadership of the Third International, they have not been always carried out. Foreign communists go back to their own countries, become interested in their own national affairs, while the Russians remain in Moscow and can watch over the affairs of

²⁵ The Russians have organized a Marx-Engels Institute in Moscow for the purpose of carrying on intensive studies in the field of Marxism. They have published the most complete editions of the works of Marx and Engels in Russian and have promoted popular editions of their works in other languages.

the International. And last, but not least, they supply the sinews of social war.²⁰

The preponderant influence of Moscow is an issue which the communists themselves have to recognize. In many communist parties, it tends to attract adventurers and doubtful individuals, who see a chance of making a personal career by serving as the "eyes" and "ears" of Moscow. In the countries in which the communists form but small groups, it tends to inflate communist activities unduly and to create a surface "movement" which in the long run does harm to the communists themselves. And even in those countries, where the communist parties are fairly strong, the temptation to appeal to Moscow for aid and encouragement, paralyzes independent effort and demoralizes communist character.

As a corollary to this, a reaction against the "orders from Moscow" is a recurrent fact in communist parties. The national resentments, spoken of above, take on the form of a protest against the tendency of Moscow to view conditions in other countries in the light of Russian experience and from

²⁰ The financial control of the Third International by the Russians is generally emphasized by its opponents. Communists, however, refuse to see the situation in that light. When in a conciliatory mood, they say that the financing of communism is analogous to that of Christian missionary societies, of the Salvation Army, and of government information bureaus in foreign lands. When more defiant, they dismiss all such criticism as "bourgeois" and "counter-revolutionary" propaganda of people who know nothing about the spirit and ways of proletarian solidarity.

the angle of Russian prospects. This resentment takes on its most serious form in the accusation that the Russian Communist Party is using the Third International merely as a means of advancing the foreign policy of Russia. In proof of this, it is pointed out that communists are everywhere kept busy agitating for Russia to the detriment of the local communist movement and to the neglect of national issues; that the whole international policy of the Third International is based on an assumption that Soviet Russia is in danger of "encirclement," an assumption which is purposely exaggerated to suit the ends of the Russian Foreign Office; above all, that communist activities in all countries are directed with a view to the effect which they may have on the political, economic, or financial negotiations with foreign countries which Russia may at the time be carrying on. Thus, in various ways, the Third International is said to be detracted from its true purpose and made to serve the interests of the Russian State.

4. Monolith and Factions

These various factors of internal friction are accentuated by the character of the communist organization. As indicated above, the Third International is determined to be a "monolith," a unified party without an opposition within its ranks. But in this aim it is persistently frustrated by the formation of "groups," "factions," and "oppositions." There are

three main causes for this. One is the tendency within each party on the part of the officials and leaders to overdo the job of enforcing "iron discipline." Practically all the important sections of the Third International have had to deal with rebellions of members against high-handed methods of leaders. A second lies in the revolt of the more alert and independent members of the communist parties against the hierarchial methods of thinking and of policy-making within the Third International. "Democratic centralism" is supposed to make room for free discussion within party ranks. In practice, however, there is a tendency within each communist party for its Polit-Bureau to fix issues, to formulate slogans, and to predetermine the course of discussion.

The third cause is the tendency of large groups of men and women to disagree on points of theory and practice. The communist parties in all countries are made up of heterogeneous elements. They bring together workers, peasants, professional men and women, educated and uneducated people; men and women of different ages, previous experience, social contacts, mental and moral habits. It is but human that on large issues there should be within each party two or more different attitudes and policies and that these differences of view should give rise to "factions."²⁷

²⁷ At present, the Third International is in conflict with a new "Right wing." Sections of the communist parties in Germany, France, America, and elsewhere are attacking the new strike strategy of the Profintern, which, in their opinion, can have but one

5. To Be or Not to Be

Regardless of these elements of friction, the Third International still has cohesion enough to be a serious factor in international politics. In Germany and France, it is a political force which exercises influence by mobilizing the discontented elements in the ranks of labor. In such countries as Czechoslovakia, though incapable of active intervention in political or economic life, it affects policies indirectly through its methods by splitting the labor and social movement and by serving as a center of passive resistance for various malcontents. In Italy, Poland, and the Balkans, it is a potential source of upheaval through its underground methods and secret organizations. In India, China, and in the colonial and semi-colonial countries it is a continual stimulant for readily aroused irritation and for the more extreme elements of the nationalistic and anti-imperialistic movements. In North and South America it is a disturbing factor in the trade unions. Everywhere, it is a

effect—that of splitting the trade unions. This “Right wing” is causing the most trouble in Germany where it also demands that, in view of the stabilization of capitalism, the communists should co-operate with the more radical socialists.

In Russia, also, a “Right” opposition has developed which is opposed to the policy of accelerating the socialization of agriculture, to repressive measures against the well-to-do peasants, and to the rapid industrialization of Russia, which, in their opinion, is the cause of Russia’s economic difficulties. The Russian Communist Party is thus forced to fight at present on two fronts—against the “Trotskyists” who are carrying on their activities underground, and against the new “Right.”

rallying point for movements of discontent—whether industrial, agrarian, political, or nationalistic in character.

However, the Third International is able to play the part it does only owing to the support which it derives from its peculiar relations with the Russian Communist Party and through the latter with the government of the U. S. S. R. Without the determined efforts of the Russian communists to maintain it, the Third International would have broken down under its internal strains in 1923 and again in 1926-27. And for the future, the question of the survival of the Third International hinges on what happens to the Russian communists and on the general trend of their policy.

Communist policy in Russia since 1923 has tried to steer the NEP along the middle of the road, though forced to make detours to the right and to the left. Barring a sudden crisis or a Napoleonic *coup-d'état*, the communist course in Russia is likely to remain what it is at present. This policy is directed towards the building up of large state industries capable of satisfying the growing needs of the domestic market and towards the development of state farms and of a rural economy which could supply most of the raw materials for industry and a surplus for export. For this purpose, foreign capital must be had in considerable quantities because savings in Russia lag greatly behind the needs of industry for renewals and for expansion.

But no matter how much the Russian communists may need foreign credits and may wish to make concessions to obtain them, they cannot scrap the Third International at once. For the Third International embodies the idea of "world revolution" which is the social myth from which the Russian Communist Party derives whatever moral strength it has. This myth serves to mobilize the energies of individual communists for their various tasks and to maintain the morale of the working population in the face of continuing economic hardships.

In foreign politics, the Third International is an instrument of no mean value. The Russian communists realize that with the World War a new factor has entered into international politics, namely, the factor of mass movements which can be mobilized for or against some definite policy. This factor has been of considerable value to them since 1919, and they are convinced that it will play an important part in the future. This belief is bound up with their view that the present international situation is unstable, that a general war within the next ten years or so is inevitable, and that the idea of world revolution will play a large part in determining the outcome of that war.

To scrap the Third International would thus mean for the Russian communists to do two things. Firstly, to destroy the social myth which gives them their sense of righteousness and their feeling of historic grandeur, and to repudiate their past. Sec-

ondly, it would mean to lose all claim to the support and devotion of millions of workers outside of Russia who regard them as the standard-bearers of the cause of mankind, and to pull down the defenses they have built up for international emergencies.

But, though the Russian Communists are not ready to scrap the Third International at once, the trend is to keep it more and more in the background. This trend cannot but grow stronger as the economic and political interrelations of Russia with the outside world become closer. As Russia becomes more interested in stability and peace, it will become increasingly more difficult for the Russian Communist Party to profess world revolution while practicing economic nationalism and diplomatic compromise.

It seems also clear that economic development in Russia must allow, for some time to come, for a large element of private enterprise. Russian experience since 1923 has shown that the NEP does not guarantee an automatic victory of collectivist economy over private economy. The success of the socialistic elements in Russian life has been secured to a large extent by "extraordinary measures," including forceful grain collections and the use of violence. But the recurrent crises created by these measures have made the Russian Communist Party anxious to avoid such measures in the future. But that means that private industry in Russia must be given more leeway and a greater freedom for development.

This also means that the present tendency towards the differentiation of Soviet Russia into groups and classes is likely to proceed more rapidly. But with such differentiation the various elements of the population—the peasants, the workers, the town middle classes—cannot but become more articulate in their struggle for economic advantage and political influence. In order to maintain a balance between them, the Russian Communist Party will have to become more and more a national party in the sense in which the socialist parties are becoming national in other countries, trying to harmonize the interests of various groups.

Such economic differentiation, for some time at least, may go along with a political monopoly of the Communist Party. But as the new economic structure in Russia gained in stability, modification of this monopoly, allowing for opposition groups and parties, would be inevitable. And if a long period of peace should prove that the world had learned to solve its international problems by the use of reason instead of force, the belief in an inevitable world war would fade away. In that case, the purposes which the Third International now serves would lose in importance, and the basis on which it now rests would be shaken.

In other words, given a period of continued stability and of world peace, the Third International would either fall into a state of inactivity or become merged into the general socialist movement. Assuming such a course of development, the Russian

communists could dispose of the Third International gradually. They could allow the Russian trade unions to join "Amsterdam" and scrap the R. I. L. U. With this as a beginning, it would be possible before long to negotiate an amalgamation between the Socialist and Communist Internationals on some basis of mutual concessions. Such policy would find support among the "Left wing" groups of the Socialist International.

Such a development would not necessarily mean the end of revolutionary movements. The adherents of the revolutionary idea in the labor and social movements of the world would either break away and form a new International, or they would form an opposition within the United Socialist-Communist International. A situation would be created similar to that which existed in the Second International before 1914. That would mean a continuance of revolutionary elements which would be confined to verbal agitation and to theoretical disputations as long as there was peace, but which would represent a force which might come into action in times of war and upheaval.

CHAPTER XXII

THE ANARCHO-SYNDICALISTS

In the back room of a little bookshop in a working-class district of Berlin are the headquarters of the International Workingmen's Association, the organization of the syndicalists. In taking the name of the First International, the syndicalists defy, as it were, both "Amsterdam" and "Moscow," proclaiming themselves the real heirs of the "revolutionary tradition of labor" and tracing that tradition not to Marx, but to Bakunin.¹

As related elsewhere, syndicalism was becoming an international movement² when it was shattered by the World War. The upheaval of 1919-20 brought the syndicalists back to public life. In France, and in other countries in which there had been syndicalist unions before the war, these were revived with a larger membership, owing to the general trade union *élan* of the day.

It was these syndicalist unions and groups in France, Spain, Portugal, Italy, Germany, Holland, Sweden, the United States, and a few other countries that the Russian communists had their eye on, when

¹ See Chapter II, pp. 52-53.

² See Chapter III, pp. 81-82.

they launched the R. I. L. U. During 1920-21, every effort was made by the Russians to win over the leaders of these groups. The communists were successful in a measure. Tom Mann of England, Rosmer, Monatte, and Monmousseau of France, Nin of Spain, William D. Haywood of the United States, met the communists more than halfway, and brought many of their followers within the fold of the R. I. L. U. In France, the adherents of the R. I. L. U. formed the United General Confederation of Labor—C. G. T. U.—of which Monmousseau became secretary.

Many of the syndicalists, however, did not like what they saw of the "dictatorship of the proletariat" in Russia, especially after the New Economic Policy was introduced,³ and began a campaign against the Third International and the R. I. L. U.⁴ In vain did the communists argue with these dissidents. All that the communists did was to split the syndicalist ranks. Some syndicalist groups remained with the R. I. L. U. These "communistic syndicalists" claimed that communism had taken over what was best in syndicalism—its theory of the state and of the social functions of trade unionism; that some of the non-syndicalistic features of communism, such as the principle of "democratic centralism," were temporary expedients; that the "dictatorship

³ See Chapter X, p. 242.

⁴ In France this minority broke away from the C. G. T. U. and in 1924 formed the General Confederation of Revolutionary Syndicalist Workers—the C. G. T. S. R.

of the proletariat" was "syndicalism in action," and that the syndicalists had to work hand in hand with the communist parties.

On the other hand, the syndicalists who refused to compromise with communism met in Berlin, from December 25, 1922, to January 2, 1923, and organized themselves into the International Workingmen's Association—the I. W. M. A. These syndicalists held a second congress in Amsterdam in March, 1925, and a third in Liege, Belgium, in May, 1928, at which congresses they elaborated their program and organization.⁵

I. THE SYNDICALIST VIEWPOINT

Syndicalism today, though basically a re-affirmation of pre-war doctrines, has a new slant and a post-war tone. Its center is no longer in France, but in Germany, and German, Swedish, and Dutch labor men are most active in shaping its ideas.⁶

Broadly, syndicalism is a movement for the revolutionary reorganization of society by means, and on the basis, of trade unions. It views the trade union not as a specific organization with limited functions,

⁵ In the trade unions which are generally designated as syndicalist, at least five groups of members are found: (1) pure anarchists, opposed to Soviet Russia; (2) anarchists who favor Soviet Russia; (3) pure syndicalists who stress their independence not only with regard to socialism, but also to anarchism; (4) Bolshevik-syndicalists; and (5) anarcho-syndicalists.

⁶ Among the chief spokesmen are Rudolf Rokker, Fritz Kater, and A. Souchy, of Germany, who act as secretaries of the I. W. M. A.

but as an institution which is potentially coextensive with society, and which, in its very nature, is a denial of the existing economic system and an affirmation of new social relations to come.

1. Monopoly and Authority

In syndicalist analysis, present day society has two main features: the monopoly of possession which finds its expression in private property, and the monopoly of authority which is embodied in the state. Private property in land and in other means of production is the cause of the economic ills of today. Because of it, small groups of owners run industry for profit and not for the needs of the people, exploit the mass of hand and brain workers who sell their labor for a living, and appropriate all progress made by science, reducing the mass of the working population to economic insecurity and social misery. Private property produces class divisions and class struggles which demoralize character and which destroy the heritage of mutual aid received by mankind from a former stage of experience. Between nations, capitalism pits the monopolists of different countries against one another and makes for crises and for wars which fall with crushing weight upon the mass of the people.

The state came into being as a result of private property and of class divisions. Its function has always been and is today to maintain in power the privileged minority and to keep the masses of the

people in economic and social subjection. The state varies in form, but not in essence; for whether monarchy or republic, despotism or democracy, it is always the "embodiment of the organized force of the possessing classes." It is of the very nature of the state to subject all human activities to its authority. That is why the state promotes centralization, the "artificial organization of life from above," and the reduction of the individual to the position of a cog in a machine. Because the state must sacrifice the interests of the community to the privileges of the few, it sets up the ideal of "loyal subjects," and favors submission to orders instead of personal initiative, uniformity as against variety, dead discipline as against inner responsibility, and spiritless drilling as against personal development. The state is, thus, the greatest obstacle to cultural progress, the bulwark of the ruling and possessing classes against the workers in their striving for emancipation.

2. Freedom and Equality

Since the World War, capitalism has shown a tendency to abandon free competition and to become "collective capitalism." Its scheme is to exploit the world according to a uniform plan, and with this end in view, it is organizing international combinations and "rationalizing" methods of production. But this new development of capitalism is not a step towards socialism, as the social-

democrats say, but the beginning of a process which leads to "state capitalism" and to "industrial slavery" for the workers.

The present development of capitalism cannot lead to socialism, because it is guided by motives of "economic dictatorship" and by the principles of centralization and of specialization. Socialism, on the other hand, means economic freedom and decentralization, a synthesis of industry with agriculture, and a manifold development of all the faculties of man. Socialism so conceived cannot be achieved merely through increased productive capacity; it presupposes a clear knowledge of social conditions, a will for constructive socialist action, and a capacity to struggle for personal freedom and for social justice.

It is the aim of the syndicalists to prepare the workers for such a society based on freedom and equality. They picture this ideal of "free socialism" as a society in which there is no state, in which all resources are owned by the people in common, in which every one works according to his capacity and is rewarded in accordance with his needs, and which is composed entirely of free associations of workers on land and in industry, so constituted that the "administration of things" takes the place of the "government of men" and all relations are built on the principles of individual and local autonomy.

In this ideal society, economic and social life is regulated by two parallel systems of organization.

On the one hand, all the workers in any branch of industry belong to an industrial union which controls the means of production and the raw materials pertaining to that industrial branch. Each industrial union administers its industry through works councils in industrial plants, and through local associations combining all plants in a district. The industrial unions of all industries form a national federation for purposes of general administration. On the other hand, the workers in all the industries of a community, whether city, town, village or region, form a general labor union, or labor exchange, which administers local consumption and social affairs. Each labor exchange gathers statistics of consumption, keeps records of housing, and knows the needs and resources of its district. For purposes of national administration, all local labor exchanges form a general federation which regulates the consumption of the country. The federation of labor exchanges and the federation of industrial unions together direct all economic and social processes. Production is regulated by means of free contracts between the different industrial unions in response to the needs of the people as determined by the labor exchanges. In the words of the syndicalists, this scheme is summed up as follows: organization of shops and factories by means of works councils; organization of general production through industrial and agricultural unions; organization of consumption through labor exchanges.

3. Regionalism and Federalism

Without explaining just how it will be done, the syndicalists think of the industrial unions and labor exchanges as linked into a world federation. Nationalism, to the syndicalist, is the "religion of the modern state"—a screen for the selfish interests of the privileged classes. The syndicalist emphasizes not only internationalism but also inter-regionalism. Not only every nation, but every regional and ethnical group must have the right to manage its own affairs, in solidarity with all other groups, and to develop its own cultural values.

4. The "World General Strike"

To carry out this program of social transformation, the syndicalists say, the workers cannot make use of the state in any form whatsoever, not even in the form of the "dictatorship of the proletariat" advocated by the communists. For though parading as the "workers' state," the "dictatorship of the proletariat" is a state, like other states, based on submission, police regulations, and political oppression. In practice, as shown in Soviet Russia, the "dictatorship of the proletariat" is an excuse for a political clique to exercise its iron rule over the working class. It is, in fact, the worst kind of state, resulting in Caesarism in politics and in the complete suppression of the individual.

Neither have the syndicalists any use for political parties. All political parties, including those of the socialists and communists, promise to use the state for the improvement of economic and social conditions. But once in power, they use the machinery of government in their own interest, which is to stay in power. No political party, not even the communist party, can serve as an instrument for the emancipation of the workers.

Instead of political dictatorship, the workers must use the economic organizations which they themselves create and in which they appear as "producers and creators of social values." Such organizations are the trade unions. The method of the social revolution is inherent in the very nature of trade unionism. At a given moment, when the workers of a country feel ready or are provoked by a crisis, they will declare a "social general strike" which will be the signal for and the beginning of the revolution. With the help of the trade unions and of works councils, independently of all political parties, the workers will proceed at once to expropriate the means of production and exchange and to make them social property. As this process is completed, the industrial unions and labor exchanges will step in and assume the constructive tasks of reorganizing production and consumption.

Undoubtedly, the syndicalists say, the possessing classes will use all forces at their command to defend property and privileges. The revolution will, there-

fore, have to be violent. But it is not necessary to hand over the task of "protecting the revolution" to any special military or political organization. The trade unions, having armed the workers, will take care of this as of all other revolutionary tasks.

A general strike in one country may start the revolution, but it cannot be successful unless it extends internationally and becomes a "world general strike" against capitalism and for immediate social reorganization in all the advanced countries of the world.

5. The Six-hour Day

While preparing for revolution, the workers must improve their condition, to the extent to which that is possible, under capitalism. Syndicalist programs of immediate demands vary in the separate countries, but in all countries the I. W. M. A. urges the demand for the six-hour day and for co-management in industry. The six-hour day is advocated, especially, as a means of reducing unemployment.

II. DIRECT ACTION

Since the syndicalists aim to abolish all politics, they can see no purpose in taking part in the political institutions of today. They abominate parliamentary elections, legislative bodies, and courts. The whole system of representative democracy, in their opinion, has but one purpose, namely, to lend an air of legality to the rule of untruth and of social injustice. Social legislation also is a snare and a

delusion for the workers. For these reasons they urge the workers to recall their representatives from all legislatures, denounce the League of Nations, and oppose the I. L. O., not only as incapable of helping the workers, but as designed to deceive and mislead them.

The syndicalists claim that the trade unions supply methods of "direct action" by means of which the workers can improve their material and moral condition now and prepare themselves for the revolutionary goal ahead. These methods of "direct action" include propaganda, street demonstrations, strikes, boycotts in various forms, including boycotts of consumers against unfair employers, and sabotage, that is, conscious damage to the property of employers. Sabotage may be either "small sabotage," consisting in doing inferior work or in obstructing production; or it may be "big sabotage," that is, planful and systematic destruction of machinery, plants, and means of communication. "Small sabotage" may be used in the daily conflicts of labor against capital, while "big sabotage" is justified only as a means of defense in political and social emergencies, such as a war or a *coup d'etat*, which threaten the lives and freedom of the people.

Direct action also includes "action of social responsibility," that is, the unmasking by workers of those employers who use inferior materials or who unload unwholesome products upon consumers. Such action is important as a means of making the

workers a real factor in shaping the aims and methods of production. The highest expression of "direct action" is the mass strike, or the simultaneous refusal to work by the workers of a whole trade or industry or several related industries. Though such mass strikes have as their purpose merely some improvement under capitalism, they bring to a focus all the latent powers of the working class for solidarity and mutual aid, and are the greatest educative force for revolution. Given a crisis or a "revolutionary situation," a mass strike may spread, outleap its original purpose, and develop into the "social general strike" which will usher in the social revolution.

As the workers must destroy not only capitalism, but also the state, the trade unions must supplement direct economic action by direct action against the state. The most important form of anti-state action is anti-militarism. Individual workers must refuse to serve in the army, while trade unions must refuse to take part in the making of munitions and of military materials.

In view of the latest developments of capitalism, its tendency to form international trusts, the methods of direct action must be applied on an international scale. The workers must meet the employers by building up international organizations of their own, capable of using international strikes and boycotts in defense of the interests of the workers of one or more countries.

In the methods of direct action, the syndicalists see the magic wand which will turn the dark present into a glorious future. The trade unions are the carriers of these methods and the "cells of the future society," and the class struggle which these methods promote is the "creative force" which is changing evil into good. The syndicalists, therefore, set themselves the task of accentuating the class struggle and of expanding the work of the trade unions so as to make them fit for their alleged historic rôle. The syndicalists want the trade unions to carry on educational work that will teach the workers the art of organizing and managing production. They want the trade unions to watch over shop committees and works councils so that the latter may not become weapons in the hands of employers for increasing profits and for weakening class consciousness. They want the trade unions to exercise control over co-operative societies so that the latter may serve revolutionary ends. They also advocate women's organizations and youth leagues, organized and directed not by political parties, but by the trade unions

III. THE I. W. M. A.

On the basis of these ideas the I. W. M. A. is organized. Its tasks are to study the labor movement everywhere, to keep its members informed of labor conditions in all countries, to practice mutual aid in big economic conflicts, to support

the class struggle in all countries, to protect the trade unions against the machinations of political parties, and to help revolutionists against the persecutions of governments. All national centers which do not belong to any other International, "organized minorities" within other Internationals, autonomous industrial or trade unions, and propaganda leagues which subscribe to the aims and principles of Anarcho-Syndicalism, are eligible for membership.

In accordance with federalist principles, the I. W. M. A. does not interfere in the affairs of its affiliated unions, except when asked to do so. Its scheme of organization is simple. Every two years a congress is held which elects an International Bureau of one member for each affiliated body. An International Secretariat of three members, elected by the congress, administers the I. W. M. A.; a control committee of three audits the books of the Association. Each affiliated body pays dues to the I. W. M. A.—ten cents per member per year.

Among the affiliated bodies of the I. W. M. A. are two international trade secretariats which are composed of syndicalist trade unions in the building and metal industries in a few countries. For purposes of anti-militarist propaganda, the I. W. M. A. and the Anti-Militarist Bureau with headquarters in The Hague, Holland, form the International Anti-Militarist Commission. An International Solidarity Union is maintained to collect funds for syndicalists

MEMBERSHIP OF INTERNATIONAL WORKING MEN'S ASSOCIATION^a

THE ANARCHO-SYNDICALISTS

573

Country and Affiliated Organizations	1923	1926	1924
Portugal: Confederaçao General do Trabalho.....	Dissolved	40,000	50,000
Spain: Confederacion Nacional del Trabajo.....	Dissolved	Dissolved	200,000
France: Confédération Générale du Travail Syndicaliste Révolutionnaire.....	7,500	10,000	...
Italy: Unione Sindicale Italiana ^b	Dissolved	Dissolved	Dissolved
Germany: Freie Arbeiter Union.....	20,000	22,000	30,000
Holland: Nederlandisch Syndicalistisch Vakverbond.....	4,000	6,000	7,500
Denmark: Revolutionært Arbejderforbund.....	500	500	500
Norway: Norsk Syndikalisk Federation.....	2,000	2,000	2,000
Sweden: Sveriges Arbetares Centralorganisation.....	34,000	37,500	37,000
Mexico: Confederacion General de los Trabajadores.....	50,000	98,000	...
Argentina: Federación Obrero Regional.....	40,000	40,000	60,000
Uruguay: Federacion Obrero Regional Uruguayana.....	4,000	4,000	4,000
Chile: Industrial Workers of the World.....	Dissolved	Dissolved	2,000
TOTAL.....	162,000	260,000	393,000

^a The figures in this table were supplied by the secretary of the I. W. M. A. There are syndicalist trade unions also in Colombia, Bolivia, and Brazil whose membership is unknown. Besides, small syndicalist propaganda groups are to be found in a few other countries. The figures for Mexico and Argentina, are disputed by students of the labor movement in those countries.

^b In 1921, the Unione Sindicale Italiana had 100,000 members.

in prison. The I. W. M. A. is also in contact with anarchist societies in various countries, which have no international organization. In France, Spain, Portugal, and a few other countries there are anarchist youth societies, which lend their support to the I. W. M. A. In Germany, the syndicalist unions, belonging to the Free Labor Union, have women's branches consisting of women workers and of workers' wives.

Nine countries in Europe and seven in the Americas have trade unions which may be classed as syndicalist. Besides, there are small anarcho-syndicalist groups which carry on some work in the trade unions of other countries. In Spain, Portugal, Argentina, and Brazil, the syndicalist unions formed, until recently, the dominant element in the labor movement. In other countries, they have been but small minorities in the general labor movement.

Leadership in the syndicalist movement is of two types. One is the "declassé intellectual," anarchistic in temperament, individualistic in habits, yet actuated by social sympathies and by an abstract love of freedom. The other is the intellectualized worker who has risen above the level of his class, but who for one reason or another cannot fit into the scheme of management which the general trade union movement provides, and who berates officialdom, politicians, and leaders in general. In different countries, these two types are found in varying proportion. The representatives of the first type are the spokes-

men and theorists of the movement; the second type supplies the organizers of the unions.

Syndicalist unions owe their existence to a variety of causes. In Portugal and Spain, trade unions were first organized by the followers of Bakunin between 1869 and 1872, and the Bakuninist tradition has persisted to this day largely owing to strong localist sentiments in both countries. Similarly, in Latin America trade unionism received its first stimulus from Italian and Spanish immigrants who were anarchistic in point of view. In France, Germany, and elsewhere, workers discouraged with socialist and communist politics, turn to the syndicalists in despair, or in hope. In some countries syndicalism also attracts workers because of anti-militarist and anti-church traditions. In the United States and in Canada, also in Sweden, the feeling against the better-paid skilled workers and their officials has been a strong motive. In these countries, syndicalists have organized some of the least organizable elements of the working population, which are often neglected or looked down upon by the more skilled and better paid workers. The syndicalists of Sweden have formed unions among the lumber and forest workers of the desolate regions of "the Arctic Circle"; the I. W. W. in the United States have raised the migratory "lumber-jack," the "blanket-stiff," the hop-picker, and oil worker, into the light of public interest.

Since 1921, the membership of the syndicalistic

unions has greatly declined in all countries. In Italy, Spain, Chile, and elsewhere the syndicalists have been forcibly deported, imprisoned, or driven underground. In France, Holland, Argentina, and in the United States they have suffered from internal divisions and from the inroads of the communists. In Germany and in the Scandinavian countries, they have been unable to hold their own against unfavorable economic conditions. In these countries, also, the syndicalist unions, owing to the pressure of the "reformist" unions, have lost members either because they have had to follow "reformist" methods or because they refused to do so and could not serve their members.⁷

As a result, the I. W. M. A. has been reduced to an almost nominal existence. Its total dues from affiliated bodies, from May 1, 1926, to April 30, 1928, amounted to about \$9,235. About 60 per cent of this sum was paid by the Swedish membership, and about one-third by the German members.⁸ The main evidence of the existence of the I. W. M. A. are the mimeographed bulletin which it publishes every two weeks, the various manifestoes which it

⁷ In Sweden, for instance, the syndicalist unions until now were opposed to making collective agreements with employers. In factories in which the syndicalists were in a majority, agreements were made by "reformist" unions. As a result, the syndicalists are now revising their position on this question of tactics. In Holland, the syndicalist unions differ but little in their daily activities from the other unions.

⁸ The other affiliated organizations have either paid nothing at all or only a part of their dues.

sends out from Berlin on such occasions as May Day or Anti-Militarist Week, and its periodic appeals for political prisoners in Russia, Bulgaria, Hungary, Italy, and other countries.

In the international labor movement, the syndicalists play the part of general critics. They attack "Amsterdam" for its "reformism" and for its "spirit of national imperialism." The R. I. L. U., in their estimate, is a "half-brother" of "Amsterdam," playing politics and collaborating with the capitalists. Among all the enemies of the Third International there are few more bitter or vehement than the syndicalists. Few have lashed as mercilessly as they have the "Bolshevistic capitalism" of Russia, the "cruel barbarism" of the Russian dictatorship, the "wrecking tactics" of the communists in the trade unions, the "lies of Moscow" and the "fraud and swindle" of the R. I. L. U.

The I. W. M. A. is thus at present chiefly a thorn in the flesh of the communists and of the R. I. L. U. Communists, in their turn, denounce the syndicalists as a "babbling sect of anarchistic fakers" and poke fun at the I. W. M. A., claiming that no one can tell what it does.

CHAPTER XXIII

THE VOICE OF THE CHRISTIANS

Whatever their differences, the Socialist, Communist, and Syndicalist Internationals are all condemned, though not in the same degree, by the International Federation of Christian Trade Unions. With this organization the earliest ideal of internationalism in the Western world comes to life in a new synthesis, in which Christian ideas are applied to modern industrial and social conditions.

At the close of the World War,¹ the Christian trade unions were caught in the general labor upheaval. Their membership increased, their activities expanded, and their organizations were consolidated. Anxious to play a part in the making of post-war labor policies, especially in the I. L. O., the leaders of the Christian trade unions of Holland succeeded, after some difficulties,² in arranging an international conference at The Hague, at which 98 delegates representing over three million workers in ten countries were present. Care was taken not to arouse "na-

¹ For pre-war Christian International, see Chapter IV, p. 115.

² Owing to war feelings, two separate conferences of Christian trade unionists met in 1919; one in Lucerne under the leadership of Germans; the other in Paris under the auspices of Christian workers of the Allied countries.

tional susceptibilities." And in order to start with a clean slate, the International Federation of Christian Trade Unions was launched on June 19, 1920, not as the successor to the pre-war Secretariat, but as an "entirely new international organization."

Between 1920 and 1922, the International Federation of Christian Trade Unions helped to organize 15 international trade secretariats which are now affiliated with it. In June, 1922, it held its second congress at Innsbruck, Austria, where it adopted a "world economic program." In September, 1925, and in September, 1928, it held its third and fourth congress in Lucerne, Switzerland, and in Munich, Germany, revising its program and statutes.

I. CHRISTIAN PRINCIPLES

According to its constitution, the International Federation of Christian Trade Unions is an association of trade unions of different countries which is based on "Christian principles." It is composed of Protestant as well as of Catholic workers who are organized either in inter-confessional unions, as in Germany, or in separate Protestant and Catholic trade unions, as in Holland. The Protestant workers form a minority in the International Federation, and the Catholics play a leading part as organizers, officials, and spokesmen.³

It is for this reason that in the formulation of

³ Of the 15 members of the Central Committee, three are Protestants.

principles and in their economic and social applications, the Catholic approach prevails. Most of those who expound these principles derive their inspiration from the encyclicals of Leo XIII and of his successors on the Apostolic Throne, quote from the writings of Catholic bishops, and think in terms of Catholic philosophy, though principles are usually stated in a form broad enough to elicit the consent of Protestants.

1. Man's Destiny

The starting point of the doctrine is the idea of man, as of a rational creature called to a personal and supernatural destiny. Man, son of God, is king of the earth, and must dominate it, subjugating the forces of nature to his service. Man cannot live without society, and society must make it possible for every man to obtain an adequate share of material welfare and to achieve his ultimate destiny.

2. The Failure of Individualism

For over a century economic and social conditions have been such as to thwart the ends for which man has his being. For the capitalist regime has been built, not on the idea of man, but on that of wealth. Its aim is to produce more and more, always more, not to meet real needs, but to gratify the greed for profits on the part of the owners of capital. To secure riches for the fortunate few, modern capitalism ignores the interests of the masses and sacrifices their

mental and moral welfare. The workers are made into mere tools of production, and man, the "king of creation," is forced to subordinate his "human majesty" to the productive process.

Modern capitalism is thus in its nature and in its general purpose anti-Christian, and the doctrine of economic liberalism with which capitalism is bound up is false in its premises and wrong in its conclusions. The unlimited liberty of individuals, for which economic liberalism stands, results not in the common good and in social order, but in misery for the many and in social disorder. Man is a composite of many contradictory tendencies, and not only must he exercise self-control, but he must also have authority to guide him in his economic and social as well as in his personal conduct. There is, therefore, no hope for man in the ideas which economic liberalism holds on wealth, liberty, private initiative, the right of association, and the state.

3. The Errors of Socialism

Neither is there salvation for man, and in particular for the worker, in socialism, communism, or revolutionary syndicalism. Like liberalism, all of these varieties of the modern labor movement are based on materialist ideas and ignore the spiritual needs of mankind. They all hold out the promise of a millennium on earth which is unattainable. They are openly or overtly hostile to religion and to the Church, which is evidence of their lack of under-

standing of the highest destiny of man. They advocate the abolition of private property, which is an essential condition of economic progress, freedom, and peace. They want to suppress all competition, which would result in negligence and in irresponsibility. They stir up class struggle, which destroys the bonds of sympathy and unity between the different elements of society, and have recourse to coercion which is in violation of the deepest sentiments of human personality.

4. The Christian "House on Earth"

Liberalism, socialism, communism, and syndicalism, make the same mistake of viewing the social problem as entirely a question of economic trends and of social struggles. The Christian contribution consists in drawing inspiration from the great act of self-sacrifice of the Saviour on the Cross, and in viewing the social problem as the "eternally bleeding wound of mankind in search for the true meaning of brotherhood on earth."⁴ This spiritual approach enables the Christian trade unionists to avoid the Scylla of capitalistic individualism and the Charybdis of socialism, and to construct a social house of their own in which all men, and the workers especially, may find material happiness and spiritual well-being.

⁴ Wieber, Franz, *Unsere Christliche Grundeinstellung, in Fünf- und-Zwanzig Jahre Christliche Gewerkschaftsbewegung*, Berlin, 1924, p. 48.

This Christian house on earth must rest on the foundations of the Christian principles of justice, charity, and the common good. Individual liberty degenerates into license unless it is limited by a sense of justice and by the duties which justice imposes upon the individual in relation to other individuals, groups, and to society as a whole. Charity comes to the aid of the weak and of the unfortunate wherever and whenever justice fails. The common good is the guiding idea of all human activities, for the individual can prosper only when the social organism as a whole is healthy and strong.

To embody these principles in the life of the individual and of society, it is not necessary to destroy, but to reorganize what already exists. All that is needed is to purify the main economic and social institutions of today, to imbue them with their true purpose, and to organize their interrelations on a correct basis. The individual must be placed in society through the institutions of the family, of private property, of his trade, his class, of the nation, the state, and the church. The family is the cell of society, the source of all social sentiments and moral habits. Private property is a social necessity: the individual needs it as a means of securing his own independence and the well-being of his family. Private property, however, is not an absolute right and must be subordinated to the interests of the community.

5. Trade, Class, State, and Church

A trade, in the sense of craft or profession, is the "worldly task which is given to man by God." Through his trade, the individual performs the work which makes him a valuable member of society and obtains the material goods which enable him to achieve his spiritual ends. The individual should regard his trade not as a burden, but as a source of joy and as a moral obligation. The idea of trade or craft is connected with the idea of the enterprise or business for which the worker should have a sense of attachment and loyalty. In choosing his trade, the worker should have the aid of science, so that his choice may be in accordance with his special capacities and lead to their fullest possible development.

By the bonds of trade, the worker becomes a member of his class. It is incontestable that all those who perform subordinate work in industry and commerce form a distinct social class of workers marked off from the middle class, farmers, or other classes of independent economic position. The failure to recognize the special character of the working class is one of the vitiating features of capitalistic individualism. On the other hand, the wrong interpretation and the abuse of the class idea is the most pernicious aspect of socialism, communism, and syndicalism. For the recognition of the class structure of society does not imply a recognition of "class

struggle." It is not true, as the socialists say, that society is made up of two classes which must fight against one another until all classes are abolished. Social classes have existed in the past and will continue to exist in the future, because they are rooted in individual and economic differences which are inevitable in any society. The task is not to fan the flames of class conflicts, but to harmonize class differences and to find the *modus vivendi* which would make possible the peaceful co-operation of all classes for the common good.

A nation is an organic unit of which the various groups and classes are the constituent members. The concept of the nation implies community of people, interests, and destiny. There is no contradiction between class and nation. The individual finds his place in society through his class; each class has legitimate interests which must be recognized by the nation; while all classes must subordinate their special interests to the welfare of the nation as a whole. It is logical and "natural" for Christian workers to be national in outlook, to love country and fatherland, and to be patriotic, but to oppose chauvinism and strife between nations.

Like class and nation, the state is rooted in the material and moral needs of society. From the Christian point of view, the state should assume economic and social functions whenever that is in the interests of the common good; should protect the weak, moderate the strong, and

correct the balance of power between different groups and classes. The state must spread its protective wings especially over the working class whose economic weakness exposes it to the exploitation of the strong. But the state must not try to become all-inclusive or all-powerful, must avoid excessive centralization, and must not hinder the proper functions of voluntary organization, through which groups and classes may set forth their views and promote their interests.

While class, nation, state, and all other groups place the individual in his social environment, it is the function of the Church to minister to the needs of the soul and to the salvation of mankind. The state and other social organizations must give the Church the freedom and opportunities which it needs in order to transmit with authority the Divine Revelation and to create the spiritual environment in which alone economic and social activities may bear good fruit.⁵

II. CAPITAL AND LABOR

In accordance with these general principles is the system of industrial relations which the Christian

⁵ This paragraph on the Church is an attempt to state ideas in a way which would be acceptable to Catholics and non-Catholics alike. The Catholics themselves would state the case more strongly. As an example, one may quote Arendt, who in a book entitled *La Nature, l'Organisation et le Programme des Syndicats Ouvriers Chrétiens*, says that the "power of the Church is above all other powers and can in no case be inferior or subordinate to the civil power." Such far-reaching statements are generally avoided in the current literature of the Christian trade unionists.

trade unionists advocate. Industry, they say, should have as its aim not private profit, but social needs. The three factors of production—the owners of capital, the entrepreneurs, and the workers—should co-operate to that end. In practice, the owners of capital and the entrepreneurs are either the same people or closely allied groups, and are to be regarded as the representatives of capital. The workers represent labor. Co-operation in industry means, therefore, harmonious relations between capital and labor.

Such harmony can be attained only if both capital and labor proceed upon correct ideas of their mutual duties and rights. Capital, under private property, carries and should carry the pecuniary risks of industry, and is entitled to a reasonable reward for this and for its managerial efforts. Capital should also have freedom to exercise the rightful functions of organizing and directing production. But capital must keep in view that it is not superior to labor and that the management of industry is more closely related to work than to possession. It must also not be forgotten that capital, in all its forms, is a product of labor and that labor is the life-giving factor in production. Capital must not claim an exclusive right to control either the process of production or the distribution of the product, but must recognize the right of labor to share in both.

In its turn, labor must think of work as a duty and must do its best to make industry fulfil its eco-

conomic and social ends. In return for such efforts, the worker is entitled to compensation which will enable him to lead the life of a civilized human being. Labor must not be treated as a commodity subject to the laws of supply and demand, but as the embodiment of human personality. He who works should be protected against everything which may impair his health, stunt his personal development, or injure his moral life, and should be given full opportunity "to discharge his duties to God, his family, and to society."

The Christian trade unionists believe that these principles of industrial relations can be best put into effect by means of industrial councils. Their idea is that each industry should be guided by a council composed of an equal number of employers and workers, whose task it would be to study the problems of industry, to fix conditions of employment, and to make general rules legally binding. A central council composed of representatives of the different industrial councils would protect the consumers against the unjust demands of particular industrial groups. This central council would serve as an "economic parliament" regulating and directing industry as a whole. It would call upon the state for aid in exercising its functions of guidance and control, but the rôle of the state would be limited as much as possible. Such an industrial system is an ideal which can be realized only

slowly and through a series of many intermediate steps.⁶

Bridging the present and the future is the specific economic and social program which the Christian trade unionists advocate as a means of humanizing and Christianizing industrial relations now and here. Most of these specific measures are to be found in the programs of the reformist and socialist trade unions. The Christian trade unions advocate freedom of combination, union recognition, adequate factory inspection, regulation of home work, protective legislation for women and minors, the eight-hour day, a comprehensive system of social insurance, vocational guidance, universal technical training, and facilities for young workers to receive higher education. In the matter of wages, the Christian trade unions emphasize the need of a "just wage." That means a minimum wage for every worker which would be also a living wage, sufficient to maintain a family. It means, in addition, a family wage, including special allowances for workers with large families, calculated on a cost-of-living basis. And it means that above the minimum, the workers' wage should correspond to the special skill, aptitudes, efforts, and risks inherent in the trade or industry.

The Christian trade unions try to attain these eco-

⁶ This ideal may be called "Christian syndicalism" and has many points in common with guild socialism and syndicalism.

conomic reforms by means of peaceful negotiations with employers, and lay emphasis on collective bargaining and on collective agreements. More than trade unions of other "tendencies," they are wary of strikes and justify the use of the strike only as a measure of last resort. Instead, they favor mediation, arbitration, industrial courts for the hearing of disputes, shop committees for the adjustment of grievances, and similar schemes.

In large measure, the Christian trade unions expect the state to help them in carrying out their program. They want the state to establish trade boards to fix minimum wages in sweated industries, to collect statistics on the cost of living, to make provisions for family wage allowances, to aid the workers in building homes. In all matters of factory inspection and of social insurance, the state is to intervene to make the laws more liberal and their enforcement more rigid. The state is to co-operate in these activities with the trade unions so that the latter may gradually become an integral part of the industrial system and prepare for the constructive functions which would fall to them under an ideal system of industrial relations.

III. CHRISTIAN TRADE UNIONISM

Fifteen countries in Europe and three countries in North and South America have trade unions which call themselves Christian. Their membership on January 1, 1928, was over three million. Half of this

membership is in Germany, while another 25 per cent is in Belgium and Holland. Of the other countries, only France, Czechoslovakia, and Poland have substantial memberships.

In form of organization, these unions follow the usual pattern of local unions, national trade unions, local labor councils, and national federations or national centers. In several countries the Christian trade unions are inter-confessional, having both Protestant and Catholic members. In Holland and Switzerland there are separate Protestant and Catholic trade unions.

In industrial make-up the Christian unions differ from country to country. The French Confederation of Christian Workers, for instance, consists of 53 local or regional unions and of seven national trade unions, and its strongest support is the union of office workers and clerks. The Federation of the Christian Trade Unions of Germany is composed of 18 national trade unions covering as many industries, but the bulk of its membership are the miners, metal workers, and textile workers of the Rhine Province and Westphalia, and land workers.⁷ The Belgian Federation of Christian Trade Unions draws its greatest support from the mining regions and among the textile workers of Flanders. In the other countries of Europe, in addition to textile and gen-

⁷ There is in Germany also an independent Federation of Christian Commercial Employees which has 300,000 members and is the largest and strongest single Christian trade union.

eral factory workers, the Christian unions have their largest following among railroad workers, post-office employees, and clerks.

There are differences also in administration and general policy. In Germany, Holland, Austria, and Belgium, the Christian trade unions are more highly centralized than in France. Initiation fees and membership dues vary widely. All Christian trade unions stress the need of building up strong funds and benefits for their members, such as sickness, death, invalidity, and out-of-work benefits. But these funds and benefits vary in accordance with budgets which depend on dues and membership. All the Christian unions, excepting those of the civil servants, have also strike funds and pay strike benefits.

Since the war, the Christian trade unions have won a place for themselves in the general labor movement. They take part in elections to shop committees and to industrial councils, are represented in hearings before mediation and arbitration commissions, and are accorded recognition in other official bodies dealing with labor questions. In those industries in which they are strong, the "free" unions co-operate with them in negotiations with employers and in the signing of collective agreements.

None the less, the relations between the "free" and Christian trade unions in most countries remain unfriendly. The leaders of the "free" unions argue that there is no reason for the existence of separate

Christian trade unions and that the reluctance of the Christian trade unions to strike weakens the labor movement. On the other hand, the leaders of the Christian trade unions, while willing to co-operate with other unions for limited economic ends, maintain that the "free" trade unions are in fact socialistic and anti-religious, that they are a menace to the mind and soul of the workers, that neutrality in the labor movement towards religion leads to the supremacy of anti-religious doctrines, and that Christian trade unions are, therefore, absolutely necessary.

To counteract the intellectual and political influence of the "free" or socialistic unions, the Christian trade unions stress the religious aspect of their work as much as possible. Where the unions are on a confessional basis, union meetings begin and end in prayer. In some "union houses" where the offices of the Christian trade unions are located, there are chapels where daily services are performed. In the offices, the walls are hung with reproductions of the Christ and with religious pictures. In the educational work of the unions, much time is given to discussion of Christian ideas in relation to industrial life.

Besides, the Christian trade unions are in close contact with religious organizations and with political parties which profess religious aims. The members of the Christian trade unions are expected to belong to the Workers' Leagues—either Catholic or

Protestant.⁸ In Germany, the Christian trade unionists support the Center Party, to which the principal leaders belong. In Belgium, they support the Christian Democrats, in Austria the Christian Social Party, in Holland the Catholic and the Protestant parties, and in Italy the People's Party.⁹

In so far as their relation to the church is concerned, the Christian trade unions may be divided into three groups. In the Catholic trade unions of Holland, the church plays a large part. Catholic priests act as advisers to trade union leaders, and there are special priests who are regarded as the delegates of the Episcopal Authority in the trade unions and whose mission it is to watch over the work of the trade unions. This is in accordance with the Catholic view that the trade union, as a lay organization, may be managed by independently elected officials, but should be under the surveillance of the Church, which alone can care for the "purity of faith and for the Christian morals of the people." In Belgium, there is a committee of six ecclesiastic directors who act as the delegates of the bishops in their relations with the trade unions.¹⁰

Germany represents the other extreme. Owing to

⁸ In several countries there has been friction from time to time between the workers' leagues and the unions.

⁹ At the same time the Christian trade unions in Belgium, Holland, and Germany, where they are strongest, claim to be non-political in character. In Belgium and France, an official of a Christian trade union who is elected to a political office must resign his trade union post.

¹⁰ Arendt, *ibid.*, p. 122.

their interconfessional character, to national traditions, and to the fact that they have to deal with employers who are more often Protestant than Catholic, the Christian trade unions of Germany steer a more independent course in relation to the church. They are closer to the Catholic Center political party than to the church hierarchy. In other countries, the Christian trade unions are in close contact with the church, but are not supervised as are the unions in Holland.

IV. INTERNATIONAL ACTIVITIES

The international activities of the Christian trade unions are in keeping with their general principles. The International Federation of Christian Trade Unions has a modest idea of what an international labor organization can and should be. It must not be a "super-state" such as "Amsterdam" "dreams of," nor must it assume to dictate to the labor movements of the separate countries. Its rôle should be that of a center of information, documentation, and consultation, which becomes a "center of action" only through the "continuous and real co-operation of the affiliated national bodies."

In harmony with the modesty of its aims is the simplicity of its organization. Every three years, a convention is held at which reports are presented on selected topics and resolutions are adopted. Each affiliated national center is free to send as many delegates as it chooses. Voting is on the basis of pro-

portional representation, in accordance with membership. An International Council having one delegate from each affiliated national center is elected by the congress, which elects also an executive committee of five including the general secretary.

Since 1920, P. J. S. Serrarens, a former teacher in the schools of Holland, has been general secretary of the Federation. His offices, consisting of three large rooms, are located in the building of the Dutch Catholic Trade Unions which stands by the musty waters of a stagnant canal in the historic and quiet little town of Utrecht, in Holland. An assistant secretary, one clerk, and a translator form the staff, with whose help the routine business of correspondence, of arranging for the meetings of the International Council, and of publishing the monthly bulletin,¹¹ is carried on. The budget is about ten thousand dollars a year.¹²

The work of the International Council and of the general secretary centers around four tasks. One is propaganda to clarify the principles for which the Federation stands and to spread them among the workers. In this work, the International Federation co-operates with international religious organizations which advocate similar social ideas.¹³

¹¹ The Bulletin is published in French, German, and Dutch.

¹² In 1927, the Christian International received about \$8,524 in dues, of which \$4,890 was paid by Germany; \$1,667 by the Catholic and Protestant unions of Holland; and \$785 by Belgium.

¹³ In April, 1928, the Protestant workers' societies of Germany, Holland, Polish Silesia, and Switzerland met at Dusseldorf and

A second task is to keep the Christian trade unions of the different countries informed of one another's activities. This purpose is promoted by means of the bulletin, to the extent to which its small size permits, and of personal contacts between the general secretary and the national centers. A third task is mutual aid, which is largely for purposes of propaganda and organization. In 1923, the International Federation collected some money among its affiliated members for the Christian trade unions of Germany. Such activities have so far been very limited.

The fourth task of the International Federation is to make its voice heard on issues of international policy. Its assumptions are that "world economy cannot be restored without the co-operation of the working class" and that "Christian labor" has a specific function to perform in this respect. The Federation advocates the cancellation of the inter-allied debts, a gradual approach to free trade, reduction of non-productive expenditures; it censures Fascism and social repression; in regard to Russia it demands that the Soviet government recognize the pre-war Russian debts and the rights of private property, as a condition for the resumption of international relations. Holding that "wages and condi-

formed an "International Society of Evangelical Workers' Associations" to spread the "social principles of the Bible." In July, 1928, the Catholic Workers' Leagues of several countries met at Cologne and formed the "Catholic International of Labor." These two organizations promise to support the International Federation of Christian Trade Unions.

tions of employment are determined not only by the economic resources and trade outlets of a country, but also by the intensity of international competition," it endorses Section XIII of the Treaty of Versailles and the program of the I. L. O.

The International Federation of Christian Trade Unions does not believe that the "great heads of states" can be influenced by the resolutions of a labor International, or that labor can obtain international aims by means of strikes, boycotts, or embargoes. It ridicules the "loud cries" and "small results" of "Amsterdam," and prefers to confine itself to the modest method of exerting influence on governments through its national centers. It is not too optimistic about the possibilities of international governmental action. It finds that even the I. L. O., which it hailed at first as "an institution of the greatest importance to the working class of the whole world," does not show brilliant results because governments fail to live up even to Conventions which they ratify. It is, therefore, in favor of supporting non-official organizations, such as the International Association for Social Progress, which may help to create a public opinion favorable to international labor legislation.¹⁴

Nevertheless, the Christian International demands

¹⁴ The International Association for Social Progress was organized in 1925, through the amalgamation of the International Association for Labor Legislation, the International Association for the Prevention of Unemployment, and of the International Committee for Social Insurance.

recognition in official international bodies which deal with labor and social problems. At present, it is represented in the annual conference of the I. L. O.¹⁵ and in the Advisory Economic Commission created by the Council of the League of Nations after the Economic Conference of May, 1927, having broken "the monopoly of the socialists to represent the workers in the international field." It demands a place also on the Governing Body of the I. L. O.

In its activities, the International Federation of Christian Trade Unions is supported by the 15 Trade Secretariats which it helped to organize. These secretariats are, in fact, part of the International Federation, whose Council they consult on all matters of importance. In organization, these Christian secretariats do not differ materially from the Trade Secretariats affiliated with "Amsterdam."¹⁶ At present most of the Christian secretariats are little more than bureaus of information.

Since 1920, the International Federation and the Christian Trade Secretariats have lost in membership. The same factors which have caused the decrease in the membership of "Amsterdam" have also affected the Christian unions. Their losses have been especially severe in Italy and Germany.

In seeking avenues of expansion, the leaders of the Christian International do not look to England or to the United States. They regard the British and

¹⁵ See Chapter XIX, p. 490.

¹⁶ See Chapter XVIII.

MEMBERSHIP OF INTERNATIONAL FEDERATION OF CHRISTIAN TRADE UNIONS^a

Country and Affiliated Organization.	1928	1925	1922
Germany: Gesamtverband der Christlichen Gewerkschaften Deutschlands.....	717,631	628,241	1,142,956
Austria: Zentralkommission der Christlichen Gewerkschaften Oesterreichs.....	76,000	80,128	78,561
Switzer- (Christlichnationaler Gewerkschaftsbund der Schweiz.. land: {Schweizerischer Verband evangelischer Arbeiter und Angestellter.....	18,093 6,233}	10,211	14,959
Luxemburg: Fédération des Syndicats Chrétiens de Luxembourg	1,300	500	500
Holland: {Roomsche Katholiek Werkliedenverbond in Nederland	124,850	94,729	151,644
Belgium: {Christelijk Nationaal Vakverbond in Nederland.....	53,636	50,687	73,549
France: Confédération des Syndicats Chrétiens de Belgique..	155,079	149,841	200,202
Spain: Confédération Française des Travailleurs Chrétiens...	101,565	101,276	129,000
Italy: Confédération Nacional de Sindicatos Catolicos de Obreros	40,000	40,000	42,319
{Risska Českoslowanska Vseodborova Komise	...	413,633	1,052,694
Czechoslovakia {Krestanskosocialni.....	44,673	80,000	...
{Verband der Christlichen Gewerkschaften für das Gebiet des tschechoslowakischen Staates	25,129	18,542	13,250
Hungary: Keresztényszocialista Országos Szakszervezetek Központja.....	52,110	115,359	113,855
Yugoslavia: Jugoslovanska Strokovna Zveza.....	5,500	2,550	22,500
TOTAL	1,421,789	1,785,697	3,035,989

^a The figures in this table are based on the reports of the Christian International to the Congresses.

American trade unions as Christian in spirit, if not in name. The affiliation of the British unions with "Amsterdam" they explain as an oddity due to British ignorance of the true character of Continental unionism. As long as British trade unionism retains its traditional attitudes, as long as the American trade unions do not constitute a danger for the religion of their members and fight socialism, the Christian trade unionists promise not to oppose them. Neither do the Christian trade unionists look with much hope to the newly developing trade unionism of Asia and Africa. Their interest is in Continental Europe and in the countries of North and South America outside of the United States.

It is clear, however, that whatever success may attend its efforts, the Christian International must remain a minority in the international labor movement. As such, it can neither inaugurate important action in the trade union world, nor exercise much influence on international policy. Though so widely different in politics and religion, it tends in economic matters, especially in the work of the I. L. O., to reinforce "Amsterdam."

CHAPTER XXIV

HORIZONS AHEAD

What lies ahead of the international labor movement in the near future is clear from what was said in the foregoing chapters. In brief, all the international labor organizations are entering a period of lesser activity and influence. For the time being, the international ties of labor are being weakened by the breakdowns and failures of the past ten years and by the general waning of faith in international good-will caused by post-war economic nationalism. The trend in all countries is towards what may be called the "nationalization of labor," that is, the incorporation of labor in one way or another into the national economic organism, in order to increase national efficiency in the battle for a larger share of world markets and of world power.

There is no question that the international labor organizations could increase their influence, despite unfavorable external conditions, if they could consolidate their forces on the basis of a common program. But the probability of unity in the near future is slight. On the contrary, the struggle for the control of the labor movement is bound to con-

tinue between "Amsterdam," the socialists, the Third International, the syndicalists, the Christian trade unions, and the American Federation of Labor, and internal divisions and continental separatism are likely not only to persist, but to become accentuated.

Nevertheless, even in its weakened condition, international labor organization cannot but be a factor of considerable moment in world economics and world politics. By helping to suggest and to popularize policies of international co-operation, and by assisting in carrying them out, "Amsterdam" and the socialists reinforce the liberal trends in world relations. Through the Trade Secretariats, as well as through the International Labor Organization of the League of Nations, international economic institutions of lasting value are being built up. On the other hand, the Third International will continue to stand in the near future as a warning, threatening to take matters in its own hands in case the leaders in world affairs fail to solve the problems which arise.

Whether beyond these immediate horizons there lie wider ones for international labor action will depend in part on economic and political pressures, in part on conscious planning and ideal purposiveness. Undoubtedly, more pressures are coming from the outside world which will tend to stimulate labor to a greater internationalism of mind and method.¹

¹ International mindedness may be defined as the habit of surveying the world as a whole, of viewing conditions in any particular country in relation to world developments, and it is

Such are the technical changes which play havoc with national boundaries, the growth of international trusts or cartels which, it is assumed, will exercise regulating methods not only over prices but also over wages and working conditions, the spread of industrialism to new countries such as India and China, and the growth of foreign investments in such areas as the Far East and Latin America where investors' policies cannot but stimulate the growth of native labor organization. Of even wider scope are the general preoccupation with the idea of a world economy, the closer political interrelations of all countries, and the desire to counteract the rivalries and conflicts between the Great Powers and the less developed or colonial countries in order to preserve peace.

While these objective factors tend to make organized labor in different countries aware of the international character of many of the problems with which it has to deal, their effects are counterbalanced by the trend within the labor movement towards what may be called "labor nationalism." For labor may fall back, in the future, as it has in the past, upon methods of solution which are distinctly nationalistic in character. In the question of migration, for instance, labor may prefer a policy of restriction or of total exclusion as against a policy of

associated with the idea of mutual aid and of immediate interests. International solidarity implies a feeling of a common social destiny which is fostered by socialist thought and influence.

freedom. In the question of trade competition it has the alternative of increasing national efficiency, of making sacrifices in wage rates and in hours of labor, as against the policy of setting up international standards. In trying to improve its condition in the separate countries, it may join with employers in advocating protective tariffs instead of following policies of free trade.

This conflict between nationalism and internationalism in the labor movement is likely to persist because it springs from a general dualism which has its roots in the very position of the worker in modern industrial society. As a member of his craft or trade, the worker is anxious to secure his position within his trade and to promote the interests of that trade. As a member of the community, in his quality of human being and citizen, he is prompted to seek salvation for himself in larger social ideas and policies. In his first capacity, the worker develops attitudes of group egotism, evolves narrow theories of craft or trade interests, and falls into monopolistic ways and methods. In his larger human rôle, he transcends the limits of craft or trade, develops an interest in economic and social ideals, and shows a readiness for more expansive forms of political and social action.

This basic dualism gives rise to several dualistic processes. One is the conflict between group and general interests. The labor movement of a country is carried along by trade and industrial groups

which differ in skill, in industrial status, in earning capacity, in education, and in cultural backgrounds. It is a function of the labor movement to weld this heterogeneous mass into a unified whole. But no matter how far a labor movement of a country may proceed in this direction, it can hardly succeed fully. Owing to industrial changes, new trade and industrial groups are continuously forming which upset the equilibrium attained, and which give new impetus to the group struggle within the general movement.

A second conflict is that which arises between "immediate demands" and social ideals. In so far as immediate demands or short-run objectives are concerned, there is little disagreement among labor organizations. In relation to hours, to the establishment of minimum rates of wages and of working standards, in relation to labor protection, to the right of organization and freedom of action, to the protection and technical education of the working youth—existing workers' organizations are more or less in agreement. There is some difference of opinion on how these short-run objectives may best be obtained. But these are not as great as may at first appear, and, as trade union action becomes more important, these differences tend to grow less. For these demands grow out of the needs and tasks which arise out of the position of the worker in his trade or industry, and the logic of this position shapes his thinking and modes of procedure.

But when labor oversteps the limits of its short-run demands, it becomes a house divided against itself. This cannot be otherwise, for in dealing with large social problems and ideas the worker is less influenced by his immediate industrial background and more by general cultural conditions. Inevitably, on the question of socialism or of political ideals, the labor movement of each country breaks up into warring factions which have no mercy for one another.

A third process of differentiation is the tendency of the labor movement to form national or regional types which differ in social ideas and outlook and in the relative value placed on various forms of action such as trade unionism, politics, social legislation, employer-employee collaboration, or class struggle. In each country the type of the labor movement is shaped in part by the composition of its industrial population, by the differences in the economic position of the different groups of the working population, and by the relative influence of these different groups, that is, by the fact whether the labor movement is more under the influence of miners or building workers or metal workers or workers in the semi-skilled and unskilled trades and industries.

But in as large a measure the forms of the labor movement depend on the general character and tempo of industrial life. In an industrially developed and dynamic country, the worker is moved more by the hope of immediate security and of economic advancement through his trade, and is in-

clined towards conservative trade unionism. In industrially declining countries he is moved by a strong sense of insecurity and is ready for more radical and militant forms of action. A similar predominance of radical ideas and methods is found in new industrial countries, where large social visions serve as a stimulus to collective action; while in static countries, where a relative sense of security exists, the worker is inclined to think more in terms of citizenship and human values than in those of trade interests. As the industrial character of a country changes, its labor movement changes, becoming more or less conservative or aggressive in accordance with changing conditions, but the division of the labor movements of the separate countries into types persists.

It is these dualistic processes which create in the international labor movement a trend towards dispersion and disintegration. To begin with, it is hard for the average worker who is concerned with his trade interests to think of large international issues. His mind is centered on demands which are of a limited character, such as agreements with employers, wage rates, and trade problems which are local or at most national in scope. When he tries to think of workers in other countries he can do so only vaguely, being but little if at all familiar with economic conditions in other countries and having but a vague picture in his mind of what labor in other countries is like.

When faced by problems which are international in character, the workers find themselves under the pressure of solidly organized national economies. Especially, in the advanced industrial countries, the workers cannot but feel that it may serve their immediate interests best to combine with the employers of their respective countries against the rest of the world, in order to share whatever national advantages they have in world markets. In the industrially advanced countries of the West the workers also feel that they are socially nearer to their respective employers than to the workers in the backward countries.

In their turn, workers in less developed countries find it difficult to maintain international standards in view of the resulting competitive disadvantages. As long as capital investments in the less industrial areas are made under prevailing conditions, higher labor standards may mean a retardation of capital imports and of industrial development and an unfavorable position in world markets which may affect the immediate interests of labor in these areas unfavorably. There is thus reproduced in the international labor movement a conflict which reflects the general economic struggle of nations.

The tendency towards internal disruption is fostered to some extent by the very nature of international labor action, especially in cases of large economic conflicts. Every large strike which assumes international importance tends to transfer trade

from one country to another, as was shown by the coal strike in England in 1926. This situation means that a strike in one country creates opportunities for employment and for improving labor conditions for the workers of other countries which these workers are eager to make use of. In other words, just at the moment when international labor action is most needed the strain on the workers becomes greatest. It has been argued that it is advisable that workers of other countries should work during a strike in some one country because the fear of losing markets to their competitors exercises pressure upon employers in the country where a strike is on and forces them to come to terms with their workers more quickly than would otherwise be the case. Whether this argument is correct or not, it remains true that it is difficult for workers to forego immediate advantages for the sake of a more or less remote ideal.

Culturally, also, the international labor movement is marked by the persistence of national traditions and of racial prejudices. The workers in every country live in a general environment by which their minds are largely formed. With the growth of democracy and with the development of free education, the possibilities of contact between classes and groups become greater, and the tendency to generalize the traditions and ideals of a country becomes stronger. National modes of thought, and national traditions permeate the labor movement and shape themselves into national labor patterns.

This process is accentuated by the leadership of labor in all countries. As a rule, the leaders of labor are men and women who are too well endowed to continue the routine life of the average worker in modern society, but who for one reason or another do not pass into other classes. In their capacity of officials and negotiators, however, these leaders come in close contact with the employing and middle classes, become vitally interested in national institutions, and absorb the common elements of national thought, which they pass on to the rank and file.

These various national interests and habits of mind, and the persistence of national types in the labor movement, give rise to another conflict which hampers international labor action, namely, the conflict between central authority and national autonomy. Every national labor movement places special value on its own forms and is reluctant to delegate power to an international authority. Also, the labor movements of the larger and more advanced countries try to play a dominant part internationally, creating in the labor movement a tendency which reflects the conflicts of the Great Powers in world politics. It is for this reason that one or another international labor organization becomes more closely identified with the destinies of one or another country, which gives rise to what may be designated as "labor imperialism."

To sum up, the international labor movement, as an attempt to build up institutions for international

economic and political co-operation, appears subject to many of the limitations which have affected similar efforts of other social groups. It has to develop within a world system based upon rival national economies and competing national interests. It inherits nationalistic structures, national traditions, and national points of view. Its absolute promises are hedged in by conscious and unconscious reservations which cannot but make its performances dualistic in purpose and partial in their results.

It is for these reasons that international labor action is likely to continue for some time merely as a subsidiary method in the arsenal of national labor organizations. The process of promoting and enlarging international labor associations will go on as a result of the problems of an international character which arise for labor out of its economic and political condition, especially, as a result of migration, of large strikes, of world competition, of the struggle for industrial democracy, and of war and peace. But in trying to meet these problems, organized labor in the different countries will continue to swing between the opposite ideas and methods of international co-operation and of national self-sufficiency.

However, if organized labor should develop a more conscious world-mindedness and a better technique for international co-operation, the tendency within the international labor movement towards uniformity and unity may assert itself over the tendency towards disunion and disruption. That the former

tendency has great force is revealed by the past and present of workers' internationalism. For one hundred years it has shown itself in a continuity of ideas, of purposes, and of fundamental processes. To-day, it is revealed in the similarity of aims and in the close interdependence which characterize the international labor organizations, despite their doctrinal differences and conflicting methods. While far from achieving either order or neatness, this unity expresses itself in a dynamic progression amidst complex ideas, clashing creeds, and conflicts of method, and in the tendency of one or another organization, of one or another country, under certain conditions, to assume leadership and to carry the major elements of the entire movement in a common impulse towards a common goal.

It is owing to this continuity and to this capacity for dynamic progression that workers' internationalism cannot but occupy an ever larger place in the international scheme, in the more distant future. Whether the particular organizations now in existence survive or collapse, makes little difference. Others will arise in the future, as they have in the past, with similar aims and methods—based on the functional differentiation into international trade unionism, international legal regulation, international social reform, and international social revolution. With time, this international tendency cannot but find increasing support in the evolution of what may be a special class of labor diplomats, that

is, of labor leaders who feel that they are equal to the tasks of international diplomacy and who are eager for the new and wider opportunities which such tasks offer.

As in the past, so in the future, one of the main questions will be whether workers' internationalism will be reconstructive or revolutionary. That will depend upon the success with which society learns to treat the causes of social revolution. If the past is any guide to the future, it is clear that revolutionary ideas follow modern industrialism like a shadow. In all countries where industrialism appears, groups of workers and of intellectuals spring up who are more interested in economic equality and social justice than in trade improvements and who are driven by the will to power to embrace the doctrines of social revolution in one form or another.

But it is also clear from the history of the past hundred years that these revolutionary minorities cannot make revolutions at will. Revolutions, like wars, are caused by changes in the relative power of economic groups, social classes, and countries. These changes necessitate some change in the political and economic institutions of a country, or in the map of the world, or in the allotment of world resources, and it is the incapacity to make these readjustments peacefully and rationally that results in wars and revolutions which give the professional or idealistic revolutionists their chance. Once a country is caught

in a revolutionary upheaval, it becomes vitally interested in extending the area of revolution, in internationalizing it, and supplies a stimulus for the promotion of revolutionary organizations. It is for this reason that the international labor movement, though inherently tending to resist revolution, must continue to carry a challenge to society which may threaten to break out in violent form, as long as no means are devised for directing revolutionary energies into channels of social and international reconstruction.

Looking ahead, the revolutionary aspects of workers' internationalism loom as a possible consequence of the risks of new complications and wars which are inherent in our post-war nationalism and which might land the nations of the world in an impasse similar to that of 1914. It seems quite obvious that in such an emergency organized labor, even if completely united in opposition to another world war, would not be able to prevent it. True, as a result of the World War there is a stronger anti-war sentiment in the **ranks** of organized labor in Europe than ever before. But this is far from being a guarantee against war. The Versailles Treaty has left in its trail nationalistic feelings which can be easily aroused and which, under certain circumstances, would swamp the ranks of labor as well as of other members of the community. The growing nationalisms of Latin America and of Asia are other

disturbing factors. Besides, organized labor is a minority in all countries, and it may be unable to control unorganized labor which is culturally and politically of a fluctuating character, and which is easily swayed by war-like sentiments in a crisis.

Even within the ranks of socialist workers, there could not but be division in view of socialist-communist antagonism. The influence of communism in this respect might be decisive. The idea of a "Socialist Fatherland" which the Third International is building up, is likely to provoke a deep rift in all labor movements in case of war. But while such divisions would make labor impotent to prevent war, it would also make it more difficult for governments to control all the forces of labor and to counteract those elements which would swing over to the idea of revolution, if war broke out.

Herein lies the warning of the past to the future. From the point of view of labor, as well as for the welfare of the world, the most important function of all international labor organizations becomes that of eliminating the probability of future wars. But to do that, these organizations must press their demands for economic justice at home and abroad, for fair play in the use of the economic resources of the world, and for the development of methods by which the relative claims and rights of nations and classes may be amicably adjusted. They must serve as guardians of the international machinery which now exists and as

missionaries for promoting new and more effective instruments of international co-operation. Along this road lies the chance of workers' internationalism for greater unity in its own ranks and for leadership in the movement towards a Great World Society.

APPENDIX TABLES

I. DUES PAID TO THE INTERNATIONAL FEDERATION OF TRADE UNIONS, 1922-1926^a
(In United States dollars ^b)

By Countries	1926	1925	1924	1923	1922
TOTAL.....	50,618	66,253	67,738	30,948	36,223
Great Britain.....	15,007	20,858	20,034	19,812	22,726
Germany.....	21,929	24,790	34,222	137	2,026
France.....	813	2,839	1,873	1,500	470
Belgium.....	1,141	4,183	1,146	1,614	1,454
Holland.....	913	887	825	923	1,004
Austria.....	1,171	3,614	207	147	22
Czechoslovakia.....	2,217	1,584	522	102	391
Switzerland.....	626	651	888	870	962
Sweden.....	1,851	1,733	1,525	1,388	1,202
Denmark.....	1,150	1,142	1,068	1,480	924
Spain.....	1,054	1,017	963	913	943
Poland.....	1,203	502	415	12	29
Canada.....	586	563	—	845	300
Other Countries.....	957	1,890	4,050	1,205	3,770

^a The figures in this table are taken from the financial statements published by the I. F. T. U. in its reports to the congresses. In addition to dues, the I. F. T. U. has an income from its printing, translations, sale of literature, etc. In 1920 and 1921, the dues received by the I. F. T. U. were \$40,915 and \$44,325 respectively.

^b Conversion from Dutch florins into dollars is made on the basis of the average exchange rate for the year.

II. MONEY COLLECTED BY THE INTERNATIONAL FEDERATION (In United States)

Collections by Countries	1926		1925
	For British General Strike	For British Miners	For British India Textile Workers
TOTAL	189,629^b	645,820^b	12,929^b
Great Britain	—	—	6,548
France	—	1,425 ^e	—
Belgium	2,437	28,141 ^e	1,386
Luxemburg	277	—	—
Spain	1,896	5,766	—
Italy	—	—	—
Switzerland	27,786	23,299	58
Germany	36,409	228,971	472
Austria	—	40,144	—
Czechoslovakia	2,337	22,614	348
Hungary	—	593	—
Holland	24,059	89,977	—
Denmark	39,472	65,017	4,087
Norway ^f	—	15,296	—
Sweden	53,416	28,248	—
Finland	—	—	—
Latvia	153	14	—
Memel	—	—	30
Russia ^f	—	—	—
Poland	—	985 ^e	—
Rumania	—	202	—
Bulgaria	—	—	—
Yugoslavia	261	—	—
Palestine	97	751	—
India ^f	—	3,151	—
Australia ^f	—	5,292	—
South Africa ^f	—	2,400	—
New Zealand ^f	—	27,820	—
Argentina	—	—	—
Mexico ^f	996	2,964	—
United States ^f	—	51,675	—
Canada	—	492	—
Miscellaneous	28	385	—

^a The figures given in this table were published in the *International Trade Union Movement* for May, 1927.

^b Conversion from Dutch florins into dollars is made on the basis of the average rate of exchange for the year. Owing to this there are slight differences in amounts given from actual amounts. Thus, Mexican labor sent \$1,000 instead of \$996.

APPENDIX

623

OF TRADE UNIONS FOR RELIEF PURPOSES, 1919-1928 *
(Dollars)

1925	1923	1921-23	1919-20
For General Strike in Denmark	For German Trade Unions	For Russian Famine Relief	For Vienna
934,667 ^b	187,342 ^b	800,723 ^c	417,249 ^d
8,270	11,820	47,439	43,431
422	1,314	60,132	50,733
5,721	4,516	130,309	8,087
56	127	1,334	1,345
159	618	11,714	—
324	780	135,552	11,174
5,967	9,765	29,366	—
330,565	—	40,992	20,494
8,626	23,564	27,455	—
1,984	11,554	182,954	—
362	1,114	—	—
19,728	15,486	63,505	104,207
—	27,226	18,239	25,083
194,869	3,372	—	11,887
341,636	48,381	41,998	90,808
9,523	585	1,561	—
43	76	1,295	—
100	—	—	—
5,729	719	—	—
—	—	598	—
26	20	185	—
—	37	1,380	—
557	194	171	—
—	—	—	—
—	—	55	—
—	—	—	—
—	—	—	—
—	—	—	—
—	321	4,314	—
—	—	—	—
—	24,700	—	—
—	—	175	—
—	—	—	—

^c Conversion from Dutch florins into dollars is made on the basis of the average monthly rate of exchange for period from December 1, 1921, to February 1, 1923.

^d Conversion from Dutch florins into dollars is made on the basis of the average monthly rate of exchange for period from October 1, 1919, to July 1, 1920.

* France, Belgium, and Poland, were then in the throes of inflation.

† Countries not affiliated with the I. F. T. U.

III. RATIO OF ORGANIZED WORKERS TO POPULATION BY COUNTRIES December 31, 1924 ¹

Country	Population	Organized Workers	
		Total Number	As Percentage of Population
Great Britain	40,560,588	5,531,000	13.6
Ireland	4,390,219	148,501	3.4
Iceland	94,690	4,000	4.2
France	39,209,766	1,068,046	2.7
Belgium	7,539,568	726,126	9.6
Luxemburg	260,767	14,087	5.4
Spain	21,658,222	453,578	2.1
Portugal	6,032,991	36,000	0.6
Italy	38,835,941	2,234,520	5.1
Switzerland	3,880,320	261,713	6.7
Germany	59,852,682	6,900,000	11.5
Austria	6,526,661	1,044,068	16.0
Czechoslovakia	13,611,349	1,669,456	12.3
Hungary	8,119,432	267,885	3.3
Holland	7,086,913	517,914	7.3
Denmark	3,267,831	306,158	9.4
Norway	2,649,775	94,567	3.6
Sweden	5,987,520	451,650	7.5
Finland	3,402,593	47,312	1.4
Esthonia	1,110,538	30,000	2.7
Latvia	1,596,131	38,867	2.4
U. S. S. R. (Russia)	131,299,007	6,604,684	5.0
Memel	150,000	3,894	2.6
Poland	27,178,690	539,089	1.9
Roumania	17,393,149	46,863	0.3
Bulgaria	4,958,400	49,803	1.0
Yugoslavia	12,017,323	64,000	0.5
British India	319,929,583	195,800	0.06
Dutch East Indies	49,350,834	60,000	0.1
China	436,094,953	300,000	0.07
Japan	57,655,000	230,000	0.4
Egypt	13,000,000	12,000	0.09
South Africa	8,000,000	27,670	0.3
Australia	5,749,807	729,155	12.7
New Zealand	1,099,449	96,821	8.8
Argentina	8,698,516	120,000	1.4
Brazil	30,635,605	104,000	0.3
Chili	3,754,951	162,000	4.3
Peru	5,550,000	25,000	0.5
Cuba	2,889,004	100,000	3.5
Mexico	13,886,948	838,000	6.2
United States of America	106,138,806	3,606,738	3.5
Canada	8,788,483	201,931	2.3
TOTAL		35,962,946	

¹ These figures include organized workers belonging to the different international organizations and some that have no international affiliations whatsoever.

This table is the basis of the maps on pages 406-407.

BIBLIOGRAPHICAL NOTES

In the writing of this book which ranges over a wide field, it was necessary to draw upon a large number of books, pamphlets, documents, reports, and periodicals. While the author is tempted to conform to the ancient and honorable tradition of piling up an impressive bibliography, he would not be serving an important enough purpose to justify the extra space required. The titles listed below are arranged by chapters and are intended to help the reader in finding the sources of quotations used, and in pursuing further phases of the subject in which he or she may be especially interested.

INTRODUCTION

Gooch, G. P., *Nationalism*, London, 1920.

Hayes, Carlton, J. H., *Essays on Nationalism*, New York, 1926.

Muir, Ramsay, *Nationalism and Internationalism* (2nd ed.), London, 1919.

Potter, Pitman B., *An Introduction to the Study of International Organization*, New York, 1922.

CHAPTER I

THE TEEMING MASS OF IDEAS, 1830-1848

As our perspective widens, the social history of the first half of the nineteenth century appears more fascinating and significant. That is especially true of the history of socialist ideas. Marxian socialists, following

Engels, have drawn a sharp line between their own "scientific" socialism and the "utopian" socialism of Marx's predecessors. But our changed view of science invalidates this distinction and places a new value on the conceptual innovations and inventive schemes of the pre-Marxian socialists. Much new light has been thrown on these earlier socialists in the recent writings of Tugan-Baranowsky, L. Pöhle, R. Liefmann, H. Bourguin, and Franz Oppenheimer; while the meaning of the earlier labor movements is made clearer in the works of Sidney and Beatrice Webb, John R. Commons, G. D. H. Cole, and R. H. Tawney.

Adler, Max, *Engels als Denker*, Berlin, 1920.

Advielle, Victor, *Historie du Gracchus Babeuf et du Babouvisme*, Paris, 1884.

Andler, Charles, *Le Manifeste Communiste de Karl Marx et Friedrich Engels*, Paris, 1901.

Beer, M., *History of British Socialism*, 2 vols.

Carlyle, Thomas, *Chartism*, London, 1858.

Fournière, Eugène, *Le Règne de Louis-Philippe*; one of the volumes in *l'Histoire Socialiste*, edited by Jean Jaurès, Paris, 1906.

Friedensburg, Wilhelm, *Stephan Born*, Leipzig, 1923.

Hammond, J. L., and Barbara, *The Village Labourer*, London, 1913.

Hammond, J. L., and Barbara, *The Town Labourer*, London, 1917.

Hammond, J. L., and Barbara, *The Skilled Labourer*, London, 1919.

Hobson, J. A., *Richard Cobden—The International Man*, London, 1919.

Hovell, Mark, *The Chartist Movement*, London, 1918.

Mayer, G., *Friedrich Engels, 1820-1851*, Berlin, 1920.

Mill, John Stuart, *Letters*, edited by Hugh S. R. Elliott (2 vols.), New York, 1910.

- Nettlau, Max, *Der Vorfrühling der Anarchie*, Berlin, 1925.
- Postgate, R. W., *Revolution from 1789 to 1906*, London, 1920.
- Quärck, Max, *Die Erste Deutsche Arbeiterbewegung*, Leipzig, 1924.
- Wade, John, *A History of the Middle and Working Classes* (3d ed.), London, 1835.
- Webb, Sidney and Beatrice, *The History of Trade Unionism*, New York, 1920.
- West, Julius, *A History of the Chartist Movement*, London, 1920.

CHAPTER II

THE FIRST INTERNATIONAL, 1864-1876

There is no adequate history of the First International. Most accounts have been written either by pro-Marxians or Bakuninists.

The literature on Marx and Marxism is voluminous, but a satisfactory account of the man and of his work may be obtained from the biographies written since 1918 by M. Beer, H. J. Laski, F. R. Salter, Ferdinand Toennis, R. Wilbrandt, and A. Loria. The most elaborate biography is that written by Franz Mehring. The shorter writings of Marx—such as the *Civil War in France*—are brilliant in style and revelatory of his passion, wide knowledge, and political insight.

The works of Bakunin have been collected and edited by Max Nettlau.

- Brupbacher, Fritz, *Marx und Bakunin*, Berlin, 1922.
- Garin, J., *L'Anarchie et les Anarchistes*, Paris, 1885.
- Guillaume, James, *L'Internationale; Documents et Souvenirs (1864-1878)*, Paris, 1905-1910.

- Louis, Paul, *Histoire de la Classe Ouvrière en France*, Paris, 1927.
- Nettlau, Max, *Der Anarchismus von Proudhon zu Kropotkin*, Berlin, 1927.
- Postgate, R. W., *The Workers' International* (a vivid little book), London, 1920.
- Riasanoff, D., *Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels*, New York, 1926.
- Schlüter, Hermann, *Die Internationale in Amerika*, Chicago, 1918. (Excellent, though limited in scope. The writer was at one time editor of the Journal of the Brewery Workers' Union.)
- Tawney, R. H., *The British Labor Movement*, Yale University Press, New Haven, 1925.
- Villetard, Edmond, *History of the International*, London, 1874.
- Weill, G., *Histoire du Mouvement Social en France*, Paris, 1924.

CHAPTER III

THE SECOND INTERNATIONAL, 1889-1914

The Second International has been treated only in an incidental and cursory manner by writers on socialism. Brief, and as a rule unilluminating, chapters on it may be found in the older histories of socialism such as that of Kirkup. Post-war writings on the Second International are distorted by controversy.

- Bebel, August, *My Life*, University of Chicago Press, 1913.
- Bernstein, E., *Evolutionary Socialism*, New York, 1909.
- Dickinson, G. Lowes, *The International Anarchy*, 1904-1914, London, 1926.
- Hillquit, Morris, *History of Socialism in the United States* (5th ed.), New York, 1910.

- Kautsky, Karl, *The Economic Doctrines of Karl Marx*, London, 1925.
- Kautsky, Karl, *The Road to Power*, Chicago, 1909.
- Kautsky, Karl, *The Social Revolution*, Chicago, 1902.
- Levine, Louis (Lewis L. Lorwin), *Syndicalism in France*, New York, 1914.
- Ogg, Frederick Austin, *Economic Development of Modern Europe*, New York, 1920.
- Orth, S. P., *Socialism and Democracy in Europe*, New York, 1913.
- Proceedings of the Congresses of the Second International, 1889-1910.* These proceedings are in different languages and were published in the countries where the congresses were held.
- Shadwell, Arthur, *The Socialist Movement* (2 vols.), London, 1925.
- Sombart, Werner, *Der Proletarische Sozialismus* (2 vols.), Berlin, 1924.
- Tom Mann's Memoirs*, London, 1923.
- Varennes, Henri, *De Ravachol à Caserio*, Paris, 1895.

CHAPTER IV

INTERNATIONAL LABOR SECRETARIATS

No attempt has been made before to sum up the pre-war history of international trade unionism.

- Legien, Karl, *Die Gewerkschaftliche Internationale, Sozialistische Monatshefte*, Berlin, 1910.
- International Reports of the Trade Union Movement*, published by the International Secretariat of National Trade Union Centers, Berlin, 1903-1913.
- Sassenbach, J., *Twenty-Five Years of International Trade Unionism*, Amsterdam, 1926.
-

CHAPTER V

AMERICAN-EUROPEAN LABOR RELATIONS, 1881-1914

This chapter is based largely on the private correspondence between Gompers and European labor leaders which is in the files of the American Federation of Labor.

American Federationist, 1895-1914.

Brissenden, P. F., *The I. W. W., A Study in American Syndicalism*, New York, 1919.

Levine, Louis (Lewis L. Lorwin), "The Development of Syndicalism in the United States," *Political Science Quarterly*, December, 1913.

Proceedings of the Conventions of the American Federation of Labor, 1881-1914.

CHAPTER VI

THE GREAT FAILURE

Laidler, Harry W., *Socialism in Thought and Action*, New York, 1921.

Walling, W. E., *The Socialists and the War*, New York, 1915.

CHAPTER VII

THE ORIGIN OF THE THIRD INTERNATIONAL, 1914-1919

To feel the full force of the shattering effect of the war on the socialist movement, one must read the socialist periodicals of those years. The bulk of the immense literature of the war and post-war period consists of pamphlets and magazine articles.

Balabanoff, Angelica, *Memoirs of a Zimmerwaldian* (in Russian), Moscow, 1926.

- Bevan, Edwyn, *German Social Democracy During the War*, London, 1918.
- Bourdeau, J., *La Minorité Socialiste Allemande*, 1916.
- Dutte, R. Palme, *The Two Internationals*, London, 1920.
- Kautsky, Karl, *Die Internationale und der Krieg*, Berlin, 1915.
- Kellogg, Paul, and Gleason, Arthur, *British Labor and the War*, New York, 1919.
- La Guerre, Les Socialistes Belges, et l'Internationale*, Brussels, 1918; published by the Belgian Socialists.
- Laidler, H. W., *Socialism in Thought and Action*, New York, 1921.
- Lenin, N., *Sur la Route de l'Insurrection*, Paris, 1924.
- Lenin, N., *Les Elections à l'Assemblée Constituante et la Dictature du Proletariat*, Paris, 1919.
- Lensch, Paul, *Three Years of World Revolution*, London, 1918.
- Levine, Louis (Lewis L. Lorwin), *Labor and Socialism in France* (Report prepared for the War Labor Policies Board), Washington, 1918.
- Louis, Paul, *La Crise du Socialisme Mondial*, Paris, 1921.
- Manifeste et Résolution de l'Internationale Communiste*, introduction by Boris Souvarine, Paris, 1919.
- Mase, Jean, *De Zimmerwald au Bolchevisme*, Paris, 1920.
- Renaudel, Pierre, *L'Internationale à Berne*, Paris, 1919.
- Royer, E., *The German Socialists and Belgium*, London, 1915.
- Scheidemann, Ph., *Die Deutsche Sozial-Demokratie*, 1916.
- Stroebel, Heinrich, *The German Revolution and After*, New York, 1923.
- Trotsky, L., *War and the International*, 1914.
- Zévaès, A., *Le Parti Socialiste, 1904-1923*, Paris, 1923.

CHAPTER VIII

THE INTERNATIONAL FEDERATION OF TRADE UNIONS,
1914-1918

This chapter is based on reports of convention proceedings, on magazine articles, and on private correspondence.

Bauer, Stefan, *International Labor Legislation and the Society of Nations*, Bulletin No. 254 of the United States Bureau of Labor Statistics, Washington, 1919.

I. F. T. U., *First Report on the Activities of*, July, 1919—December, 1921; Amsterdam, 1922.

Mertens, Corneille, *Le Mouvement Syndical International*, Bruxelles, 1923.

Proceedings of the Conventions of the American Federation of Labor, 1914-1921.

Sassenbach, J., *Twenty-Five Years of International Trade Unionism*, Amsterdam, 1926.

Solano, E. John, editor, *Labour as an International Problem*, London, 1920.

United States Bureau of Labor Statistics, Bulletin No. 268, *Historical Survey of International Action Affecting Labor*, Washington, D. C., 1920.

CHAPTER IX

WORLD UPHEAVAL, 1919-1920

Some of the volumes in the series published by the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace deal with the history of labor in different countries during the war and show the developments which led up to the post-war labor upheaval. Most of the material for this chapter was obtained from current periodicals and from the reports of proceedings of the meetings of the various international

labor organizations, which are referred to in this and other chapters.

Bauer, Otto, *Der Weg zum Sozialismus*, Wien, 1919.

Cole, G. D. H., *A Short History of the British Working Class Movement* (Vol. III), 1900-1927, London, 1927.

Fimmen, Edo, *The International Federation of Trade Unions*, Amsterdam, 1922.

Gleason, A., *What the Workers Want*, New York, 1920.

Hillquit, M., *Present Day Socialism*, New York, 1920.

I. F. T. U., *First Report on the Activities of*, Amsterdam, 1922.

International Labor Office, *Report Presented to the Peace Conference of 1919*, Geneva, 1920.

Kautsky, Karl, *Vergangenheit und Zukunft der Internationale*, Wien, 1920.

Macartney, C. A., *The Social Revolution in Austria*, Cambridge, 1926.

MacDonald, J. R., *Parliament and Democracy*, London, 1920.

Toynbee, A., *Europe After the Peace Conference*, London, 1925.

Webb, S. and B., *Constitution for the Socialist Commonwealth of Great Britain*, New York, 1921.

Zinoviev, G., *World Revolution and the Communist International*, 1920.

CHAPTER X

RETREAT AND CONFUSION, 1921-1923

See note to Chapter IX.

Conférence des Trois Internationales, held in Berlin in April, 1922; Bruxelles, 1922.

Exécutif Elargi de l'Internationale Communiste, Compte

- Rendu*, held in Moscow in February-March, 1922; Paris, 1922.
- Farbman, M., *Bolshevism in Retreat*, London, 1923.
- I. F. T. U., *Report on Activities, 1922-1924*, Amsterdam, 1924.
- I. F. T. U., *Report of the International Peace Congress held at the Hague in December, 1922*.
- I. F. T. U., *Report of Congress at Rome*, Amsterdam, 1923.
- Kautsky, Karl, *Die Proletarische Revolution und Ihr Programm*, Berlin, 1922.
- Kommunistische Partei Deutschlands, *Spartakusbriege*, 1920.
- Lieb knecht, Karl, *Reden*, Berlin, 1921.
- Losovsky, A., *Aims and Tactics of the Trade Unions*, Moscow, 1921.
- Merrheim, A., *Amsterdam où Moscou*, Paris, 1924.
- Montgomery, B. G., *British and Continental Labour Policy*, London, 1922.
- Oudegeest, J., *Social Legislation*, Amsterdam, 1924.
- R. I. L. U., *Die Organisationsfrage auf dem Zweiten Kongress*, Berlin, 1923.
- Toynbee, A., *Survey of International Affairs, 1920-1923*, London, 1925.
- Trotsky, Léon, *Nouvelle Étape*, Paris, 1922.
- Trotsky, Léon, *Le Communisme en France*, 1922.
- Trotsky, Léon, *La Crise du Parti Communiste Français*, 1922.
- Zagorski, S. O., *La République des Soviets*, 1921.
- Zinoviev, G., *L'Internationale Communiste au Travail*, Paris, 1923.

CHAPTER XI

WASHINGTON, AMSTERDAM, AND MOSCOW, 1919-1924

A large part of the material for this chapter was obtained from the private correspondence and from unpub-

lished reports in the files of the American Federation of Labor.

American Federation of Labor, *History; Encyclopedia; Reference Book*; Washington, 1924.

Hardman, J. B. S., editor, *American Labor Dynamics*, New York, 1928.

Oneal, James, *American Communism*, New York, 1927.

Proceedings of the Conventions of the American Federation of Labor, 1919-1925.

Saposs, David J., *Left Wing Unionism*, New York, 1926.

Schneider, D. M., *The Workers' (Communist) Party and American Trade Unions*, Baltimore, 1928.

CHAPTER XII

PAN-AMERICAN LABOR, 1918-1924

See note to Chapter XI.

Beals, Carlton, *Mexico*, New York, 1923.

Jones, Chester Lloyd, *Mexico and Its Reconstruction*, New York, 1921.

Iglesias, S., *Articles in the American Federationist*, September-October, 1927.

Proceedings of the Conventions of the American Federation of Labor, 1900-1925.

Proceedings of the Congresses of the Pan-American Federation of Labor, 1919-1925.

Retinger, J. H., *Morones of Mexico*, London, 1926.

Tannenbaum, Frank, *The Mexican Agrarian Revolution*, Institute of Economics, Washington, 1929.

Walling, W. E., *The Mexican Question*, New York, 1927.

CHAPTER XIII

MOODS OF TRANSITION, 1924-1926

This and the subsequent chapters are based almost entirely on newspapers, magazine articles, and reports.

Cinquième Congrès Communiste Mondial, Résolutions, Paris, 1924.

Communist International, *La Réorganisation des Partis Communistes*, Paris, 1925.

Cook, A. J., *The Nine Days*, London, 1926. (This pamphlet was taken out of circulation after Cook came to an understanding with the General Council of the Trade Union Congress.)

Exécutif Elargi de l'Internationale Communiste, held in March-April, 1925; Paris, 1925.

Lubin, Isador, and Everett, Helen, *The British Coal Dilemma*, Institute of Economics, Washington, 1927.

Lorwin, Lewis L., *The British Strike and International Labor*, Washington, 1926.

Nearing, Scott, *The British General Strike*, New York, 1926.

Trotsky, L., *Whither England?*, London, 1925.

Zinoviev, G., *Les Traits Essentiels de la Période Actuelle*, Paris, 1925.

CHAPTER XIV

INTERNAL CRISIS, 1926-1927

See note to Chapter XIII.

Alouf, A., *Les Syndicats et la Situation de la Classe Ouvrière dans l'U. R. S. S., 1921-1925*, Paris, 1926.

Bukharin, N. I., *Concerning Trotskyism* (in Russian), Moscow, 1925.

Dobb, Maurice, *Russian Economic Development Since the Revolution*, London, 1928.

Eastman, Max, *Since Lenin Died*, London, 1925.

Trotsky, L., *Whither Russia?*, New York, 1926.

Trotsky, L., *The Real Situation in Russia*, New York, 1928.

Stalin, I., *Le Léninisme Théorique et Pratique*, Paris, 1925.

Vor Dem Thermidor, Die Plattform der Linken Opposition in der Bolschewistischen Partei, Hamburg, no date.

CHAPTER XV

ADJUSTMENTS AND REALIGNMENTS

I. F. T. U., *Report on Activities, 1924-26*, Amsterdam, 1927.

Proceedings of the Fifth Congress of the Pan-American Federation of Labor, Washington, 1927.

CHAPTER XVI

THE COURSE OF "AMSTERDAM"

For the current history of the Amsterdam International it is essential to read the weekly Press Reports which "Amsterdam" publishes and its monthly magazine, *The International Trade Union Movement*. The I. F. T. U. has published interesting booklets on the trade union history of Belgium, Great Britain, Sweden, and Germany.

Brown, J. W., *World Migration and Labor* (2 vols.), Amsterdam, 1926.

I. F. T. U., *Third Yearbook*, Amsterdam, 1925.

I. F. T. U., *Fourth Yearbook*, Amsterdam, 1926.

I. F. T. U., *Fifth Yearbook*, Amsterdam, 1927.

I. F. T. U., *World Workers' Education*, Amsterdam, 1924.

I. F. T. U., *Reports to Congresses and Proceedings of Congresses, 1921-1928*.

Sassenbach, J., *Twenty-Five Years of International Trade Unionism*, Amsterdam, 1926.

CHAPTER XVII

"AMSTERDAM'S" SOCIALIST ALLIES

There are no outstanding theoretical writers in the socialist movement at the present time. Kautsky, though still writing, no longer enjoys the position he held before the War. Otto Bauer, the leader of the Austro-Marxists, regarded by many as the most brilliant representative of the Socialist International today, is overburdened with the work of editor, parliamentarian, and party leader, and can point to no theoretical work of major importance. The same may be said of Rudolf Hilferding, the present Minister of Finance in Germany, whose book *Das Finanz-Kapital*, published before the War, gave him theoretical prominence. Most of the socialist writers in France, England, and elsewhere, are publicists and politicians, who have neither the time nor the equipment for intensive theoretical work.

Current socialist thought can be followed best through the *Socialist Review*, published in England, *Der Kampf*, published in Vienna, *L'Avenir Social*, published in Brussels, *Die Gesellschaft*, published in Berlin, and the *Socialist Messenger* (in Russian), published by exiled Russian socialists in Berlin.

Bauer, Otto, *Bolschevismus oder Sozialdemokratie*, Wien, 1921.

Brailsford, H. N., *Socialism for Today*, London, 1925.

Brailsford and others, *The Living Wage*, London, 1926.

Dannenberg, Robert, *Vienna under Socialist Rule*, London, 1925.

Das Heidelberger Programm, Berlin, 1925.

Clayton, Joseph, *The Rise and Decline of Socialism in Great Britain*, London, 1926.

De Man, Hendrik, *Zur Psychologie des Sozialismus*, Jena, 1926.

- Hillquit, Morris, *From Marx to Lenin*, New York, 1922.
- Internationale Sozialistische Jugendarbeit, 1923-1925*, Berlin, 1925.
- Kautsky, Karl, *Labor Revolution*, London, 1925.
- Laidler, H. W., *A History of Socialist Thought*, New York, 1927.
- Laidler, H. W., and Thomas, Norman, editors, *New Tactics in Social Conflict*, New York, 1926.
- Lepinski, Franz, *Die Jungsozialistische Bewegung, ihre Geschichte und ihre Aufgaben*, Berlin, 1927.
- MacDonald, J. R., *Socialism*, London, 1921.
- Mitrany, D., *Marx versus the Peasant*, London Essays in Economics, London, 1927.
- Programm und Organisation der Deutschoesterreichischen Sozialdemokratie*, Wien, 1927.
- Stroebel, H., *Socialization in Theory and Practice*, London, 1922.
- Third Congress of the Labour and Socialist International, *Reports and Proceedings*, 1928.
- Third Congress of the Labour and Socialist International, Material submitted to, on the Colonial Problem, Zurich, 1928.
- Third Congress of the Labour and Socialist International, *Zum Kongress in Brussels*, Collection of articles published by the editors of *Der Kampf*, Wien, 1928.
- Tracey, Herbert, *The Book of the Labor Party*, London, 1925.
- Varga, Eugen, *Die Sozial-Demokratischen Parteien*, Hamburg, 1926.

CHAPTER XVIII

THE PLACE OF THE TRADE SECRETARIATS

In the preparation of this chapter, the reports of the congresses of the various trade secretariats, their stat-

utes and programs, and their journals were used as well as many of the booklets and pamphlets published by the secretariats. These reports and journals may be obtained from the secretariats whose addresses may be found in the *Yearbook* published by "Amsterdam."

Fimmen, Edo, *Labour's Alternative*, London, 1924.

Lorwin, Lewis L., and Flexner, Jean A., *The International Transport Workers' Federation*, Washington, 1926.

Lorwin, Lewis L., and Flexner, Jean A., *The International Union of Woodworkers*, Washington, 1926.

Lorwin, Lewis L., and Flexner, Jean A., *The International Metal Workers' Federation*, Washington, 1926.

Lorwin, Lewis L., and Flexner, Jean A., *The International Building Workers' Union*, American Federationist, September, 1926.

CHAPTER XIX

AMSTERDAM AND GENEVA

The International Labor Office publishes detailed bibliographies which may be obtained from Geneva or from the Washington office. From time to time there have appeared in the *International Labour Review*, the quarterly publication of the I. L. O., articles dealing with the assumptions and theoretical implications of international labor action. Here is a field in which very little, if anything, has as yet been done and for the cultivation of which the I. L. O. seems especially fitted.

Barnes, G. N., *History of the International Labour Office*, London, 1926.

International Labor Office, *Reports of the Director*, 1921-1928.

Johnston, G. A., *International Social Progress*, London, 1924.

International Labor Office, *Draft Conventions and Recommendations, 1919-1927*, Geneva, 1928.

Lowe, B. E., *The International Protection of Labor*, New York, 1921.

Perigord, Paul, *The International Labor Organization*, New York, 1926.

CHAPTER XX

THE CHALLENGE OF COMMUNISM

Communists admit that they suffer from a paucity of men and women capable of independent theoretical work. Most of the theorizing in the Third International is done by N. Bukharin, the editor of the official organ of the Russian Communist Party, the *Pravda*. Bukharin is a man of wide range in the field of philosophy, history, and economics, but he does not always rise to great theoretical heights, and is prone to formulate sweeping generalizations, à propos of a passing situation.

Aside from Bukharin's books, communist doctrines are elaborated in the theses, resolutions, and programs of the Third International. Though Bukharin has been the guiding spirit of these, during the past few years, they show the effects of collective thinking of the leaders of the communist movement. A striking feature of communist thinking, as reflected in these resolutions and programs, is its rapid shifting of position under pressure of changing conditions.

Communism produces an extensive pamphlet literature. This is due to the fact that the communists of different countries select whatever strikes them as important in proceedings of congresses or in their maga-

zines or in the speeches of leaders, and reprint such material for popular circulation.

Most of the reports of the proceedings of communist congresses, the resolutions adopted, and the programs can be found in the *International Press Correspondence*, which is published weekly. Summaries and interpretations of these are usually published in communist and labor magazines, among the best of which are the *Communist International*, the *Red Trade Union International*, and the *Labour Monthly* published in London.

Adler, Max, *Helden der Sozialen Revolution*, Berlin, 1926.

Bukharin, N., *Historical Materialism*, New York, 1925.

Bukharin, N., *Questions of Program* at the Sixth Congress of the Communist International (in Russian), Moscow, 1926.

Bukharin, N., *Karl Kautsky und Soviet-Russland*, Berlin, 1925.

Bukharin, N., *The Economic Theory of the Leisure Class*, New York, 1927.

Boukharine, N., *La Bourgeoisie Internationale et son Apôtre Karl Kautsky*, Paris, 1925.

Communist International, *Reports of Congresses; resolutions; program*.

Keynes, John M., *Laissez-Faire and Communism*, New York, 1926.

Laski, H. J., *Communism*, London, 1927.

Lenin, N., *State and Revolution*, London, 1919.

Lenin, N., *L'Imperialisme, Dernière Étape du Capitalisme*, Paris, 1925.

Lenin, N., *The Proletarian Revolution and Kautsky the Renegade*, London, 1920.

Lenin, N., *The Soviets at Work*, New York, 1918.

Marx, Karl, *Critique du Programme de Gotha*, with preface by Amedée Dunois, Paris, 1922.

- Paul, William, *Communism and Society*, London, 1922.
Trotsky, L., *Dictatorship versus Democracy*, New York, 1922.
Trotsky, L., *Lenin*, New York, 1925.

CHAPTER XXI

THE THIRD INTERNATIONAL AND ITS SATELLITES

See note to Chapter XX.

- Bukharin, N., *Results of the Sixth Congress of the Communist International* (in Russian), Moscow, 1928.
Communist International before the Sixth Congress (in Russian), Moscow, 1928.
Communist Youth International, *Four Years of* (in Russian), Moscow, 1928.
Dein Urtheil, Protokoll der Internationalen Arbeiter-Hilfe, Berlin, 1928.
Gautherot, Gustave, *Le Monde Communiste*, Paris, 1925.
Losovsky, A., *Les Syndicats Russes et la Nouvelle Politique*, Paris, 1922.
Losovsky, A., *Zwei Internationalen*, Berlin, 1921.
Losovsky, A., *Das Aktions-Programm der Roten Gewerkschafts-Internationale* (2nd ed.), Berlin, 1922.
Losovsky, A., *Fünf Jahre Rote Gewerkschafts-Internationale*, Berlin, 1925.
Losovsky, A., *Der Kampf der Kommunisten in den Gewerkschaften*, Berlin, 1922.
Losovsky, A., *La Conférence Syndicale Anglo-Sovietique*, Paris, 1925.
Losovsky, A., *Lenin und die Gewerkschaftsbewegung*, Berlin, 1924.
Losovsky, A., *L'Activité de l'Internationale Syndicale Rouge*, Paris, 1924.
Losovsky, A., *Kommunisten und Gewerkschaften*, Berlin, 1926.

- Losovsky, A., *Le Mouvement Syndical International*, Paris, 1926.
- Provisional Council of Red Trade Unions, *Materials and Documents* (in Russian), Moscow, 1920.
- Quelques Documents sur le Secours Ouvrier International*, Namur, 1926.
- R. I. L. U., *Beschlüsse und Resolutionen des Zweiten Internationalen Kongresses*, Berlin, 1923.
- R. I. L. U., *Third World Congress*, Resolutions and Decisions, Chicago, 1924.
- R. I. L. U., *Protokoll der Vierten Session des Zentralrates der Roten Gewerkschafts-Internationale*, Berlin, 1926.
- R. I. L. U., *Report of the Fourth Congress*, London, 1928.
- R. I. L. U., *Fourth Congress of the Profintern* (in Russian), Moscow, 1928.

CHAPTER XXII

THE ANARCHO-SYNDICALISTS

Before the World War, Syndicalism was elaborated by a number of brilliant French and Italian writers. Today, its theories are being worked out largely by German and Russian workingmen and journalists. Syndicalist literature today is limited in scope and content.

Freie Arbeiter Union Deutschlands, *Protokoll über die Verhandlungen vom XV Congress*, Berlin, 1925.

Girault, Ernest, *Pourquoi les Anarchistes-Communistes Français ont rallié la III Internationale?* Paris, 1926.

International Working Men's Association, reports of congresses and resolutions, published in pamphlet form and in the bulletin of the Association, 1920-1928.

- Kropotkin, Peter, *Mutual Aid*, New York, 1902.
- Kropotkin, Peter, *Fields, Factories, and Workshops*, London, new edition, 1913.
- Kropotkin, Peter, *The Conquest of Bread*, New York, 1906.
- Levine, Louis (Lewis L. Lorwin), *Syndicalism in France*, New York, 1914.
- Monatte, Pierre and others, *Left Wing Trade Unionism in France*, London, 1922.
- Monmousseau, Gaston, *Le Controle Syndical*, Paris, 1922.
- Monmousseau, Gaston, *Le Syndicalisme devant la Revolution*, Paris, 1922.
- Monmousseau, Gaston, *La Dictature du Proletariat*, Paris, 1922.
- Resolutionen des Internationalen Kongresses der Revolutionären Syndikalisten zu Berlin*, 1923.
- Rokker, Rudolf, *Die Prinzipienklärung des Syndikalismus*, Berlin, no date.
- Scott, J. W., *Syndicalism and Philosophic Realism*, London, 1919.

CHAPTER XXIII

THE VOICE OF THE CHRISTIANS

This chapter is based on the official reports of the Christian Trade Union International and of the Christian trade unions of Germany, France and Belgium, and on the writings quoted here and in the text.

- Arendt, Joseph, *La Nature, l'organisation et le programme des Syndicats Ouvriers Chrétiens*, Paris, 1926.
- Brun, Henri, *La Cité Chrétienne d'après les Enseignements Pontificaux*, Paris, 1924.

- Church, Major Archibald G., *The Christian Trade Union Movement in Germany* (no date).
- Confédération Internationale des Syndicats Chrétiens, *Compte Rendu du Deuxième Congrès*, Essen, 1922.
- Confédération Internationale des Syndicats Chrétiens, *Compte Rendu du Troisième Congrès*, Utrecht, 1926.
- C. I. S. C., *Quatrième Congrès, Rapport du Secrétaire*, 1928.
- Hemala, Franz, *Warum Christliche Gewerkschaften*, Wien, 1924.
- L'Internationale Syndicale Chrétienne pendant les Années 1922-1925*; Utrecht, 1926.
- Ryan, J. A., *Declining Liberty*, New York, 1927.
- Ryan, J. A., *Industrial Democracy from a Catholic Viewpoint*, Washington, 1925.

CHAPTER XXIV

HORIZONS AHEAD

- Cassau, Theodor, *Die Gewerkschaftsbewegung*, Berlin, 1925.
- Economic Consequences of the League*, a collection of articles, London, 1927.
- Liefman, Robert, *International Cartels, Combines, and Trusts*, London, 1927.
- Nestriepke, S., *Gewerkschaftslehre*, Stuttgart, 1922.
- Perlman, S., *Towards a Theory of the Labor Movement*, New York, 1928.
- Zwing, Karl, *Gewerkschaftliche Probleme*, Stuttgart, 1921.

DRAMATIS PERSONAE

- Adams, Charles Francis, 1807-1866. Son of President John Quincy Adams; p. 41.
- Adler, Friedrich, 1879—. Son of Victor Adler. One time lecturer on physics at University of Zurich. Active in socialist movement of Austria as editor, organizer, member of parliament, and party official since 1911; pp. 153; 158; 167; 217; 436-7.
- Adler, Victor, 1852-1918. Founder and leader of Austrian Socialist Party till his death; p. 70.
- Andreev, A., 1885—. Russian metal worker. Bolshevik since 1914; member of executive committee of All-Russian Trade Union Council and of Russian Communist Party; p. 230.
- Anseele, E., 1856—. Founder of co-operative movement in Belgium and one of founders of Belgian Labor Party. Minister of Public Works during 1918-1921; p. 70.
- Applegarth, Robert, born in 1833. British trade unionist. Secretary of the Amalgamated Society of Carpenters, 1862-1871; p. 31.
- Appleton, W. A., 1859—. Secretary of the General Federation of British Trade Unions since 1907; pp. 110; 176; 178; 196; 232-3; 260-1; 264-5; 411.
- Asquith, Herbert H., Lord Oxford, 1852-1928. Leader of Liberal Party of England and several times Prime Minister; p. 95.

Baboeuf, François Noel, 1760-1797. French communist. Founded *Société des Égaux* in 1795. Was guillo-

- tined for conspiracy to overthrow the Directorate; pp. 15; 18.
- Bakunin, Michel, 1814-1876. Russian anarchist and revolutionist; pp. 22; 47; 52-6; 67; 135; 559; 575.
- Balabanoff, Angelica. Born in Russia. Emigrated in 1897. Active in Italian socialist movement. In 1917, joined Russian Communists, but in 1922 left Russia and began campaign against Third International; pp. 156; 173.
- Barnes, G. N., 1859—. British labor leader and government official; p. 190.
- Bauer, Otto, 1881—. Leader of Austrian Socialist Party. Secretary of Foreign Affairs, 1918-19—; p. 437.
- Baumeister, A., assistant to Legien; p. 176.
- Bebel, Ferdinand August, 1840-1913. One of founders of German Social Democratic Party. Leader of his party from 1900 to 1913; pp. 47; 70; 78; 85; 135.
- Beesly, Edward Spencer, born in 1831. Professor of History at University College in London. Follower of Auguste Comte; pp. 34-5.
- Berger, Victor, 1860—. Born in Austria-Hungary. A leading American socialist. First socialist elected to Congress in 1910; p. 161.
- Berkman, Alexander. Anarchist. Born in Russia. Emigrated to the United States about 1890. Deported to Russia in 1920. Left Russia in 1922; p. 230.
- Bernstein, Eduard, 1850—. Member of German Socialist Party since 1872. Member of Reichstag. Leader of "Revisionism"; pp. 70; 77-8; 152.
- Beust, Friedrich Ferdinand, Count, 1809-1886. Imperial Chancellor of Austria, 1871-1878; p. 52.
- Bevin, E., 1881—. Secretary of Gas Workers' Union of England. Influential in British Trade Union Congress; p. 332.

- Bismarck, Otto, Prince, 1815-1898. German statesman, founder of German Empire; pp. 52; 65; 140.
- Bissolati, Leonida, 1857-1920. Italian reformist-socialist. Cabinet Minister during 1914-18; p. 150.
- Blanc, Louis, 1811-1882. French historian and socialist. Author of *L'Organisation du Travail* in 1840; p. 37.
- Blanqui, Louis Auguste, 1805-1881. French socialist and revolutionist. Spent over 40 years of his life in prison for conspiring against various French governments; pp. 16; 18; 19; 24.
- Blatchford, Robert P., 1851—. British socialist. Known especially as founder of *The Clarion* in 1892, and as author of *Merrie England*; p. 152.
- Blum, Leon. Present leader of French Socialist Party; p. 223.
- Boncour, Paul, 1873—. One of leading members of right wing of French Socialist Party. Influential in League of Nations until his resignation in 1928; p. 438.
- Bordiga, Amadeo. Leader of "left" opposition in Communist Party of Italy; pp. 224; 312.
- Bourderon, A., 1858—. Member of French Socialist Party; member of the Executive Committee of the General Confederation of Labor; pp. 155-6; 180.
- Bowerman, C. W., 1851—. President of Printing and Kindred Trades' Federation of England. Secretary of the Parliamentary Committee of the Trade Union Congress, 1910-1923; pp. 260; 265.
- Brailsford, Henry Noel, 1873—. British Socialist writer; p. 429.
- Bramley, Fred, 1874-1925. Secretary of British Trade Union Congress, 1923-1925; p. 308.
- Brandler, Heinrich, 1881—. German communist. Sec-

- retary of State in workers' government of Saxony in 1923; pp. 252; 311.
- Branting, Karl Hjalmar, 1860-1925. At one time astronomer in Stockholm observatory. Founder of Swedish Socialist Party. Several times Prime Minister of Sweden; pp. 66; 159; 167.
- Briand, Aristide, 1862—. At one time member of French Socialist Party. Several times Prime Minister of France. French Minister of Foreign Affairs since 1925; p. 72.
- Bright, John, 1811-1889. One of founders of Anti-Corn Law League. Member of Parliament, 1858-1889; p. 33.
- Broadhurst, Henry, 1840-1911. Secretary of Parliamentary Committee of British Trade Union Congress after 1874. Member of Parliament, 1894-1906; p. 117.
- Brown, John W., 1886—. One of organizers of National Federation of Professional, Technical, Administrative, and Supervisory Workers of England; pp. 273; 299; 309; 331; 365-6; 368; 411.
- Buchez, Filipppe J. B., 1796-1865. At one time a member of the Society of Carbonari. Editor of *Le Producteur*, devoted to the propaganda of co-operation in France. President of Constitutional Assembly in 1848; p. 12.
- Bukharin, N. I., 1888—. Member of Bolshevik Party since 1906. Editor of Russian paper in the United States in 1916. Editor of *Pravda* and member of Politbureau of Russian Communist Party; pp. 321; 339; 341; 349; 352; 357; 363.
- Buonarotti, Filippo M., 1761-1837. Italian revolutionist. Expelled from Italy and took part in French Revolution; p. 15.
- Burns, John, 1858—. At one time member of Amalga-

mated Engineering Union of England, and of British Socialist Party, from which he resigned in 1906. President Board of Trade in 1914; pp. 65; 66; 120.

Butler, H. B., 1883—. Assistant to secretary of the British Minister of Labor in 1917. Assistant to the general secretary of the International Commission on Labor Legislation in 1919; p. 485.

Cachin, Marcel, 1869—. At one time professor of philosophy at the University of Bordeaux. Leader of French Communist Party, editor of *L'Humanité* since 1924; pp. 160; 214; 248.

Calles, Plutarco E., 1879—. Governor of State of Sonora 1916-1918. President of Mexico 1924-1928; pp. 296; 299; 301; 373; 379.

Cameron, A. C. American trade unionist between 1860 and 1870; p. 50.

Capmany, Rafael Z. Secretary of State for Mexico under President Carranza; p. 283.

Carranza, Venustiano, 1859-1920. President of Mexico, 1914-1920; pp. 278; 282-4; 292-3.

Chamberlain, Sir Austen, 1863—. Member of British Parliament since 1892. Secretary of Foreign Affairs since 1924; p. 358.

Chiang-Kai-Shek, born circa 1878. Revolutionary general and one of leaders of Kuo-Min-Tang in China. Elected President of China in 1928; p. 356.

Cipriani, Amilcare, 1845-1918. Italian revolutionist and socialist. Took part in Garibaldi expedition in 1860. Member of First International. Imprisoned at various times in Italy and France and expelled from both countries; p. 70.

Citrine, Walter, 1887—. Secretary of Electrical Workers' Union of England from 1914 to 1920. Member of Independent Labor Party since 1909. Secretary

- of Trade Union Congress since 1926; pp. 336; 366-7; 381.
- Clemenceau, Georges, 1841—. French statesman. Permanent chairman of Versailles Peace Conference; p. 166.
- Cobbett, William, 1763-1835. English radical writer and agitator; p. 14.
- Cobden, Richard, 1804-1865. English statesman. Founder of Anti-Corn Law League; pp. 21; 57.
- Colins, J. G. C. A. H., 1793-1859. Belgian sociologist and socialist; p. 42.
- Condé, Eduardo, Spanish immigrant, at one time active in labor movement of Cuba; p. 276.
- Cook, A. J., 1884—. Secretary Miners' Federation of Great Britain since 1919; pp. 333; 335.
- Costa, Andreas, died in 1910. Italian socialist. At one time follower of Bakunin, then organizer of Italian Socialist Party; p. 70.
- Coullery, Dr. Swiss social reformer; p. 42.
- Cramp, C. T., 1876—. English labor leader. Secretary National Union of Railwaymen. Member of Executive Committee of Labor Party; p. 332.
- Cremer, William R., 1838-1908. Secretary of First International; pp. 31; 33; 45.
- Crispien, Arthur, 1875—. German social democrat. President Independent Socialist Party, 1919-20. Minister of State of Wurttemberg after revolution. Member of Reichstag since 1920; p. 152.
- Daumig, Ernst, 1868-1922. German socialist writer. Joined German Communist Party, but left it in 1921; p. 226.
- David, Eduard, 1863—. German socialist. Member of Reichstag since 1903. Under-secretary of State of Foreign Affairs in 1918; p. 152.

- De Brouckère, Louis, 1870—. Belgian socialist and senator. Also professor of University of Brussels since 1919; pp. 437-8.
- De Geyter, Adolphe, 1859—. French worker. Composed the music to *L'Internationale*; p. 58.
- De Geyter, Pierre. Brother of Adolphe; p. 58.
- De La Haye, Victor. French trade unionist; p. 120.
- De La Huerta, Adolpho. Mexican general; p. 300.
- De Leon, Daniel, 1852-1914. Leader of Socialist Labor Party of America. Came to United States in 1872 from the Dutch West Indies where he was born; pp. 74; 79.
- Denikin, Anton, 1872—. Russian general and leader of army against the Soviet government; pp. 212-13.
- De Paepe, Cæsar, 1842-1890. Belgian socialist and one of founders of the Belgian Labor Party; p. 49.
- Diaz, Porfirio, 1830-1915. President and dictator of Mexico from 1877 to 1911; pp. 94; 277-9; 283.
- Disraeli, Benjamin, Lord Beaconsfield, 1804-1881. British statesman; p. 55.
- Dogadov, Alexis, 1888—. Member Metal Workers' Union since 1906 and of Bolshevik Party since 1905. Secretary of the All-Russian Trade Union Council; pp. 230; 246.
- Dunne, William F., American communist. Member of the Montana legislature 1918-1920. Co-editor of the *Daily Worker*; p. 244.
- Ebert, Friedrich, 1871-1925. German socialist leader. First President of German Republic from 1919 to 1925; pp. 152; 212; 252.
- Engels, Friedrich, 1820-1895. Friend and collaborator of Karl Marx; pp. 24-27; 37; 51; 54-56; 74; 119; 135; 144; 349; 352; 498; 549.

- Fenner-Brockway, A., 1889—. Secretary British Independent Labor Party. Imprisoned during the war as conscientious objector; p. 324.
- Ferri, Enrico, 1856—. Italian criminologist and socialist. Resigned from Socialist Party and from parliament in 1908; p. 78.
- Fimmen, Edo, 1875—. Former Secretary of the Dutch Federation of Trade Unions. Secretary International Federation of Transport Workers; pp. 196; 244; 247; 327; 331; 411; 476.
- Fischer, Ruth, 1895—. German communist. Member of German Reichstag; pp. 311; 320; 340; 352; 383; 528.
- Foster, William Z., 1881—. Successively socialist, syndicalist, and communist. Communist candidate for United States President, 1924 and 1928; pp. 129; 229; 271-2.
- Fourier, Charles F. M., 1772-1837. Author of *Théorie des Quatres Mouvements* and founder of Associationist School of Socialism; p. 12.
- Fox, Peter. Secretary of First International; p. 45.
- Frey, John P., 1871—. Editor of *Molders' Journal of America* from 1903 to 1927. Secretary of the Metal Trades Department of the American Federation of Labor since 1927; pp. 267; 369.
- Frossard, Ludovico-Oscar, 1889—. General secretary French Socialist Party in 1918-19. Secretary French Communist Party 1922-23; pp. 160; 214; 243.
- Furuseth, Andrew, 1854—. President International Seamen's Union of America since 1909. Born in Norway; came to United States in 1880; pp. 177; 257.
- Garza, Mexican general, p. 288.
- George, David Lloyd, 1863—. British statesman. Prime Minister, 1918-1922; p. 95.

- Gladstone, William E., 1809-1898. British statesman and leader of the Liberal Party; p. 55.
- Goldman, Emma, 1869—. Anarchist writer and agitator. Born in Russia, migrated to United States in 1886. Deported to Russia in 1920; left Russia in 1922; p. 230.
- Gomez, Juan Vicente, 1859—. President of Venezuela since 1922; p. 375.
- Gompers, Samuel, 1850-1924. Born in England. Came to United States in 1863. President of the American Federation of Labor from 1882 to 1924; pp. 103; 118-128; 132-3; 140; 161; 166; 174; 176-7; 179; 183; 185-8; 190-6; 233; 253-4; 258-61; 263-5; 267-9; 273-5; 278; 281-7; 289-91; 295-7; 299-301; 372-3.
- Grassman, Peter O., 1873—. Vice-President of the German Federation of Trade Unions since 1919. Socialist member of Reichstag since 1924; p. 366.
- Gray, John, 1799-1850. Became famous for his *Lecture on Human Happiness*, published in 1825; p. 12.
- Green, William, 1872—. Secretary United Mine Workers of America, 1913-1924. President American Federation of Labor since 1924; pp. 369; 374.
- Grimm, Robert, 1881—. Swiss socialist. At one time member of the Swiss National Council; pp. 154; 156.
- Guesde, Jules B., 1845-1922. French disciple of Marx. Member of Chamber of Deputies from 1893 to 1921. Minister without portfolio during war; pp. 65; 70; 77; 78.
- Guillaume, James. Swiss teacher. Disciple of Bakunin. A leader in First International; p. 140.
- Haase, Hugo, 1863-1919. Socialist member of the Reichstag from 1897-1918 with some intervals. Member of Council of People's Commissars after the Revolution of 1918. Was assassinated in the Reichstag; pp. 137; 152; 156; 212.

- Hardie, J. Keir, 1856-1915. Founder of the British Independent Labor Party in 1893. Leader of Labor Party in 1906; pp. 70; 80; 92.
- Harding, Warren G., 1865-1923. President of the United States, 1921-1923; p. 269.
- Haywood, William D., 1869-1928. American labor leader. One of the founders of the Industrial Workers of the World in 1905. Arrested many times for industrial activities. Escaped in 1920 to Russia where he died; pp. 229; 560.
- Heine, Wolfgang, 1861—. Socialist member of German Reichstag 1898-1920. At one time Minister of the Interior of Prussia; p. 152.
- Henderson, Arthur, 1863—. British socialist. At one time member of Friendly Society of Iron Founders. Secretary of Labor Party since 1911. Minister without portfolio during war. Home Secretary in 1924; pp. 79; 139; 161; 166; 187-8; 217; 437.
- Herriot, Edouard, 1872—. French statesman. Prime Minister 1924-25; pp. 305; 319; 442.
- Hervé, Gustave, 1871—. French writer and journalist. Extreme anti-militarist before the war. Nationalist and anti-socialist since the World War; p. 91.
- Hicks, George, 1879—. Successively secretary and president of the Federation of Building Trades Operatives of England since 1919. Member of the General Council of the Trade Union Congress; pp. 310; 336; 367; 411.
- Hilferding, Rudolf, 1878—. German socialist writer and leader. Minister of Finance in the Stresemann government of 1924, and again in the coalition government of Hermann Mueller of 1928; p. 217.
- Hillquit, Morris, 1870—. American socialist leader. Born in Riga, Latvia. Came to United States in 1886; pp. 79, 161; 217.

- Hindenburg, Paul von B., 1847—. German Field Marshal during the war. President of the German Republic since 1925; pp. 316; 320.
- Hitler, Adolf. Leader of Fascists in Bavaria. Held power in Munich with Ludendorff in 1923, for a day. Tried for treason in 1924 and sentenced to short term in prison; p. 251.
- Hodges, Frank, 1887—. Secretary of Miners' Federation of Great Britain from 1918 to 1924. At present adviser to Employers' Association; p. 333.
- Hodgskin, Thomas, 1783-1869. Author of *Labour Defended Against the Claims of Capital*, published in 1825; p. 12.
- Hoffman, Adolph, 1858—. German socialist who became communist; pp. 155; 226.
- Horthy de Nagybanya, N., 1868—. At one time aide-de-camp to Emperor Francis-Joseph. Regent of Hungary since 1920; pp. 206-7; 212.
- Howell, George, 1833-1910. Secretary of London Trades' Council from 1860 to 1862; p. 31.
- Hueber, Anton, 1861—. Member Social Democratic Party of Austria since 1880; secretary of Austrian Trade Union Federation; p. 127.
- Huerta, Victoriano, 1854-1916. Mexican leader of military bands; pp. 278; 282.
- Hunt, George W. P., 1859—. Elected first Governor of State of Arizona in 1911. Re-elected in 1915, 1919, and 1922; p. 288.
- Huysmans, Camille, 1871—. At one time professor at the University of Brussels. Member Belgian parliament since 1910; pp. 87; 127; 151; 166.
- Hyndman, Henry Mayers, 1842-1921. Founder of British Social Democratic Federation in 1881; pp. 65; 67; 74; 79; 152.
- Hynes, John P., 1872—. Organizer and president of the

International Association of Sheet Metal Workers of America, p. 191.

- Iglesias, Pablo, 1850-1927. Leader of Spanish Socialist Party. Printer by trade; p. 70.
- Iglesias, Santiago, 1872—. Leader of the Free Federation of Workingmen of Porto Rico since 1899, and of the Socialist Party of Porto Rico. Senator in Porto Rico since 1917; pp. 276-7; 376; 385.
- Ilg, Conrad, 1877—. President of the Swiss Metalworkers' Federation since 1917. Secretary of the International Federation of Metal-workers since 1920. A member of the Swiss parliament; p. 476.
- Jaurès, Jean Léon, 1859-1914. At one time professor of philosophy at Toulouse. Vice-President of French Chamber of Deputies under the Combes Ministry. Great orator; pp. 77-8; 85; 92; 137; 142.
- Jensen, J. Leader in Danish trade union movement; p. 101.
- Jessup, W. American labor leader during the eighteen sixties; p. 44.
- Johnson, Andrew, 1808-1875. Vice-President and President of United States, 1865 to 1869; p. 41.
- Jouhaux, Léon, 1879—. At one time secretary of the Match Workers' Union of France. Secretary of the French Confederation of Labor since 1909. Member of the Disarmament Commission of the League of Nations since 1920; pp. 127; 129; 174-7; 179; 181-4; 188; 190; 194; 196; 260; 364-5; 367; 411.
- Joynson-Hicks, Sir W., 1865—. British Home Secretary since 1924; p. 330.
- Kalinin, Michael Ivanovich, 1875—. President of the Russian Federated Soviet Republic since 1919 and

- of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics since 1923. Member Central Executive Committee of the Russian Communist Party since 1919; p. 341.
- Kamenev, Leon B. (other name Rosenfeld), 1883—. Member Bolshevik faction of the Russian Social Democratic Party since 1903. Was President of Moscow Soviet and held important positions in Soviet government and in the Communist Party from 1918 to 1927; pp. 163; 321; 340; 362; 383; 528.
- Kapp, Wolfgang, 1868—. A leading Junker of East Prussia. Headed conspiracy to overthrow German Republic in 1919; p. 213.
- Kater, Fritz. German worker and syndicalist. Secretary of German Free Labor Union; p. 561.
- Katz, Jacob. A worker in Belgium in 1836; p. 16.
- Kautsky, Karl J., 1854—. Austro-German socialist. Founder and editor of *Die Neue Zeit*, 1833-1917. Supervised publication of German official documents on the origin of the World War; pp. 74; 76-8; 135; 137; 144; 152; 165; 217.
- Kolchak, Vladimir V., 1870-1920. Russian Admiral. Leader of anti-Soviet forces, 1917-1920; pp. 169; 212-13.
- Kollontai, Alexandra,* 1872—. Founder of working women's socialist organizations in Russia. Commissar of Social Welfare in the Soviet government. Minister Plenipotentiary from the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics to Norway and to Mexico; p. 241.
- Korsch, Karl. German "Left" communist. At one time professor of jurisprudence; pp. 311; 340; 352.
- Kropotkin, Peter, 1842-1921. Russian prince, scientist, and anarchist, p. 67.
- Kun, Bela, 1886—. Hungarian socialist. War prisoner in Russia where he became communist. Organized Communist government in Hungary in March, 1919,

which was overthrown in August. Escaped to Russia; p. 212.

- Ladd, William, 1778-1841. American philanthropist and pacifist; p. 21.
- Lafargue, Paul, 1842-1911. Born in Cuba but settled in France in 1851. Son-in-law of Karl Marx. Writer on socialism; pp. 70, 74.
- Lassalle, Ferdinand, 1825-1864. Agitator for universal suffrage in Germany. Founded German Workingmen's Association in 1863; p. 37.
- Lavigne. French trade unionist; p. 71.
- Lazzari, Constantino. At one time secretary of Italian Socialist Party. One of the founders of Left wing in the party; p. 150.
- Ledebour, Georg, 1850—. German socialist. Member of Reichstag, 1900-1918. One of founders of Independent Socialist Party in 1916; pp. 152; 155; 244.
- Lee, Algernon, 1873—. Member of Socialist Party of America. New York alderman 1918-1921; p. 161.
- Legien, Carl, 1861-1920. German labor leader and socialist. Member of Reichstag 1903-1920. Member of German Peace Delegation to Versailles; pp. 101-2; 107; 112; 121; 126; 132-3; 174; 176-9; 182-4; 194; 196.
- Le Grand, Daniel, 1783-1859. Alsatian manufacturer and social reformer; pp. 20; 43; 114.
- Leipart, Theodor, 1867—. Member of German Woodworkers' Union. President of General Federation of German Trade Unions since 1921; pp. 364; 367; 411.
- Lenin, Nicolai (Ulianov, Vladimir Ilyitch), 1870-1924. Founder and leader of Russian Bolshevik Party; pp. 78; 92; 153; 155; 161; 163; 165; 211; 225; 228; 312; 349; 351-2; 499-501; 538; 549.

- Lensch, Paul. At one time leading German socialist. Recently director of non-socialist newspapers; p. 152.
- Leo XIII, Pope, 1810-1903. Elected Pope in 1878; pp. 115; 580.
- Leroux, Pierre, 1797-1871. French writer on social questions. Follower of Saint-Simon; p. 12.
- Levi, Paul, 1883—. German socialist who joined Communist Party. Communist member of Reichstag in 1920. At present a member of the Social Democratic Party and of the Reichstag; pp. 226-7; 528.
- Lewis, John L., 1880—. Vice-president and president of the United Mine Workers of America since 1917; p. 268.
- Liebkehncht, Karl A. F., 1871-1919. Son of Wilhelm Liebkehncht, German socialist. Tried for high treason for his book on *Militarism and Anti-Militarism*, in 1907. Imprisoned for anti-militarist activities during war; pp. 91; 137; 153; 211-12.
- Liebkehncht, Wilhelm, 1826-1900. Leader of German Social Democratic Party of Germany. Close friend of Karl Marx; pp. 47; 70.
- Limousin, Georges. Died in 1909. French socialist and trade unionist; p. 33.
- Lincoln, Abraham, 1809-1865. American statesman and Civil War President; p. 41.
- Longuet, Jean, 1876—. French socialist and journalist. Grandson of Karl Marx. French Deputy from 1914 to 1919; pp. 70; 152; 156; 165; 167; 172; 217; 223.
- Lord, James, 1877—. Vice-President and president of the Mining Department, American Federation of Labor, 1913-1923; p. 287.
- Loriot, Fernand. Treasurer of French Socialist Party, 1914 to 1918. Imprisoned as communist in 1920; p. 180.
- Losovsky, Arnold, 1878—. Russian Bolshevik and trade

- unionist. At one time secretary of Moscow Trade Unions. Secretary of Red International of Labor Unions since 1921; pp. 218; 230; 243; 532-3.
- Loveira, Carlos. Mexican labor leader; pp. 283; 286.
- Lovett, William, 1800-1877. A Cornish workman. Chartist leader. Later active in educational work and as pacifist; pp. 16-19.
- Ludendorff, General von, 1865—. Chief of German General Staff, 1914-1918. One of leaders of nationalist and fascist groups in Germany since 1918; p. 51.
- Luxemburg, Rosa, 1870-1919. Born in Poland. Came to Germany at the age of 16. Active in German Social Democratic Party before the war. Leading anti-war socialist, 1914-1918. Assassinated in 1919; pp. 92; 137; 153; 212.
- MacDonald, James Ramsay, 1866—. Leader of British Labor Party. Prime Minister of Great Britain in 1924; pp. 79; 138; 152; 167; 237; 305; 316; 336; 442.
- McGuire, P. J., died in 1906. At one time Secretary of United Brotherhood of Carpenters. President of American Federation of Labor in 1894; p. 120.
- Machado, Gerardo, 1873—. President of Cuba; p. 375.
- Madero, Francisco I., 1873-1913. Leader of revolution against Diaz. President of Mexico 1911-1913. Assassinated in 1913; p. 278.
- Madsen, Carl F., 1862-1928. Danish labor leader and socialist. Secretary and president of Danish Federation of Labor after 1903; p. 367.
- Magon, Enrique. A leader of the Liberal Party of Mexico in its fight against President Diaz; pp. 278-9.
- Magon, Picardo, brother and associate of Enrique Magon; pp. 278-9.

- Malatesta, Enrico, 1853—. Italian follower of Bakunin and leader of anarchist movement; p. 67.
- Mann, Tom, 1856—. British labor organizer and agitator. Secretary of Amalgamated Engineers' Union, 1919-1921. Successively socialist, syndicalist, and communist; pp. 65; 66; 121; 229; 560.
- Martoff, L. Died in 1923. Russian leader of the Menshevik faction of the Social Democratic Party. Writer and journalist; p. 78.
- Marx, Wilhelm, 1863—. Chancellor of Germany in 1924 and candidate for President of Germany; p. 320.
- Marx, Heinrich Karl, 1818-1883. Author of *Das Kapital* and founder of scientific socialism. Born in Germany. Active in revolution of 1848. After 1849 lived in London where he died; pp. 23-27; 35-37; 39; 41-43; 45; 49-56; 66-67; 74; 135; 140; 144; 173; 312; 349; 352; 419; 427; 498-500; 503; 549; 559.
- Maslov, F. German communist of Russian origin; pp. 311; 320; 340; 352; 383.
- Mazzini, Giuseppe, 1805-1872. Leader of nationalist movement of Italy. Ardent republican; pp. 12; 16; 35; 40.
- Mehring, Franz, 1846-1919. German socialist and historian; pp. 137; 153.
- Merrheim, A. Died a few years ago. French socialist and secretary of Federation of Metal Workers; pp. 153; 155-6; 177; 180.
- Mertens, Corneille, 1880—. At one time secretary of the Belgian Bookbinders' Union. Secretary of Belgian Federation of Labor since 1911. Member of Belgian Labor Party; pp. 176; 178; 188; 192; 196; 364; 367; 411.
- Metternich, Clemens, Prince von, 1773-1859. Austrian statesman; p. 11.
- Millerand, Alexandre, 1859—. At one time member of

- French Socialist Party. President of French Republic 1920 to 1924; p. 77.
- Mitchell, Isaac. Secretary of Federation of British Trade Unions; p. 101.
- Monatte, Pierre. French syndicalist. Printer by trade; pp. 153; 180; 229; 352; 560.
- Moneda, Eduardo. Member of Printing Trades' Union of Mexico. Secretary of the C. R. O. M. Director of the Government Printing Bureau of Mexico; p. 285.
- Monmousseau, Gaston. Secretary of United Confederation of Labor of France; p. 560.
- Morgari, Oddino, 1865—. Member of Italian Socialist Party since 1892. At one time deputy of Italian parliament; pp. 150; 156.
- Morones, Luis N., 1890—. Minister of Labor and Industry in Mexico under President Calles; pp. 283; 285; 287; 290; 299.
- Morris, William, 1834-1896. British poet and socialist. Author of *News from Nowhere*; p. 65.
- Morrison, Frank, 1859—. Typographical worker. Secretary of American Federation of Labor since 1897; p. 260.
- Most, John, 1846-1906. Member of German Social Democratic Party, and Deputy of German Reichstag, 1874-1878. Turned anarchist and migrated to United States in 1890; p. 67.
- Mueller, Hermann, 1876—. German socialist. Minister of Foreign Affairs, 1919-20. Chancellor of Germany from March to June, 1920. Chancellor of Germany in 1928; pp. 136-7; 437.
- Murray, Gilbert, 1866—. Professor of Greek at the University of Oxford; p. 248.
- Murray, John. American trade unionist and journalist; pp. 278; 285; 287; 291.

Mussolini, Benito, 1883—. At one time trade union and socialist agitator. Founder of Italian Fascism. Premier of Italy; pp. 150; 154; 244.

Naine, Charles, 1874—. Swiss socialist and writer. At one time member of Swiss National Council; p. 156.

Nieuwenhuis, Ferdinand Domela, born in 1846. Originally preacher at the Hague. Socialist member of Dutch parliament from 1888 to 1901. Became anarchist and anti-militarist; p. 70.

Nin, A. Spanish syndicalist who became communist; p. 560.

Noske, Gustav, 1868—. German socialist. Minister of War in 1919 and 1920. Since President of the Province of Hanover; pp. 152; 212; 217.

Obregon, Alvaro, 1880-1928. Commander of Western Army of Mexico during the revolution of 1913. President of Mexico 1920-1924. Assassinated in 1928; pp. 293; 296; 299; 300.

O'Connor, Feargus, 1794-1855. Leader of Chartism between 1840 and 1848; p. 24.

Odger, George, 1820-1877. English trade union leader; pp. 31, 33-35; 45.

Oudegeest, Jan, 1870—. Dutch trade union leader and socialist. Member of Governing Board of International Labor Organization, 1920-1927; pp. 127; 178-9; 182; 186; 188-9; 196; 245; 247; 260; 264-5; 267; 269-70; 309; 331; 364-6; 368-9; 411.

Owen, Robert, 1771-1858. British manufacturer and social reformer; pp. 12; 17; 20.

Painlevé, Paul, 1863—. French mathematician and statesman. Minister of War and Prime Minister in 1917. Republican socialist; p. 319.

- Perkins, George W., 1856—. President of Cigar-Makers' Union of America; p. 131.
- Perrochon, French labor leader during the eighteen sixties; p. 33.
- Piatakov, George, 1878—. Russian communist. At one time acting chairman of Supreme Council of National Economy; pp. 340; 362; 383.
- Plekhanov, Georges, 1857-1919. Founder of Social Democratic Party in Russia. Leader of Mensheviks; pp. 70; 74; 78.
- Poincaré, Raymond, 1860—. President of French Republic in 1913. Many times Minister and Premier of France; pp. 248; 305.
- Pottier, Eugène, 1816-1887. French socialist. Author of the *Internationale*. Fugitive to England and America after the Commune; p. 58.
- Preobrajensky, E., 1886—. Russian communist of many years' standing. Writer on financial questions; p. 340.
- Proudhon, Pierre J., 1809-1865. French economist and anarchist. Printer by trade. Became famous as author of *What Is Property?* published in 1840; pp. 37; 43; 67.
- Purcell, Albert A., 1872—. Secretary Amalgamated Polishers of England from 1900 to 1910. Member of General Council of British Trade Union Congress since 1921; pp. 309; 334; 336; 365; 367; 411.
- Radek, Karl. Active in socialist movement of Austria before the war. One of communist leaders after 1917. Brilliant journalist; pp. 251-2; 340; 528.
- Rakovsky, Christian, 1873—. Organizer and founder of Rumanian Socialist Party before the war. One of communist leaders in Russia between 1917 and 1927. President of the Ukrainian Soviet Republic in 1919; pp. 340; 362; 528.

- Ravachol, François-Auguste, 1860-1892. His father's name was Königstein, but he adopted his mother's name. Born in Lyon, France, and executed in Paris; p. 72.
- Réclus, Elisée, 1830-1905. French anarchist, writer and leader; p. 67.
- Renaudel, Pierre, 1871—. French socialist and member of the Chamber of Deputies; pp. 152; 217; 223.
- Rokker, Rudolf, 1870—. German anarchist and syndicalist. Spent many years in exile in London where he published an anarchist paper; returned to Germany after the war; p. 561.
- Roosevelt, Theodore, 1858-1919. American statesman. President of the United States, 1901-1909; p. 95.
- Rosenberg, Arthur, 1899—. Professor University of Berlin and communist member of the Reichstag since 1924; p. 311.
- Rosmer. French syndicalist and communist; pp. 229; 352; 560.
- Rossoni, E. Former Italian syndicalist. Now head of the Fascist trade unions of Italy; p. 492.
- Russell, Charles Edward, 1860—. American writer and one time member of Socialist Party. Member of American Mission to Russia in 1917; p. 161.
- Rykov, Aleksei I., 1881—. Member Russian Bolshevik Party since 1905. President of the Council of People's Commissars of U. S. S. R. since 1924; pp. 321; 341; 363.
- Saint-Simon, Claude H., 1760-1825. French socialist. Author of *Le Nouveau Christianisme*; p. 12.
- Sandler, Rickard J., 1884—. Swedish socialist since 1911. Teacher by profession. Minister of Commerce and Finance in various governments. Prime Minister of Sweden since 1925; p. 438.

- Sapronov, T. V., 1887—. Russian trade unionist and communist. At one time member of Central Committee of Communist Party and important member of Soviet government; pp. 340; 383.
- Sassenbach, Johann, 1866—. Active in educational and labor movements of Germany. Secretary of the International Federation of Trade Unions since 1923; pp. 192; 270; 309; 364; 369; 382; 411.
- Saumonneau, Louise, 1875—. French Socialist and communist; p. 180.
- Scheidemann, Philipp, 1865—. German socialist leader. Chancellor of Germany in 1919; pp. 152; 211; 217.
- Scholem, A. German communist of Russian origin; pp. 311; 340; 352.
- Serrarens, P. J. S., 1888—. Dutch labor leader and social worker; p. 596.
- Serrati, Giacinto M., 1872-1926. Italian socialist. Editor of Italian newspapers in Italy, New York, Switzerland. Imprisoned many times for anti-war propaganda; pp. 224; 244.
- Shaw, George Bernard, 1856—. English playwright and socialist; p. 65.
- Shaw, R. Secretary of First International; p. 45.
- Shaw, Thomas, 1872—. Formerly textile worker. Secretary of International Textile Workers' Union. Formerly also secretary of Second International; p. 436.
- Shliapnikov, Alexander, 1883—. Russian metal worker and Bolshevik. In 1917-18 was Commissar of Labor; p. 241.
- Skoropadski, Paul. Hetman of Ukraine in 1918; p. 169.
- Smilga, I. T., 1892—. Russian communist. In 1921-23 was acting chairman of the Supreme Council of National Economy; pp. 340; 361; 383.

- Smirnov, V. M. Russian communist; leader of "opposition group"; p. 340.
- Sorge, F. A. German socialist. Came to America after 1848. Active in American labor and socialist movements; pp. 55; 119.
- Souchy, A. German journalist. Secretary International Association of Workingmen; p. 561.
- Souvarine, Boris. French journalist. At one time one of the leaders of the French Communist Party; pp. 312; 352; 528.
- Stalin, Joseph V. (Dzugashvili), 1879—. Georgian by birth. Member of Russian Social Democratic Party since 1896. At one time Commissar for Nationalities. Secretary of Russian Communist Party; pp. 321; 339; 341; 349; 350; 352; 357; 363.
- Stambolisky, A. Prime Minister of Bulgaria from 1920 to 1923; p. 250.
- Stegerwald, A. A leader in the Christian trade union movement and in the Catholic Center Party of Germany; p. 116.
- Stresemann, Gustav, 1878—. Chancellor of Germany in 1923. German Minister of Foreign Affairs in various governments; pp. 249; 252.
- Stuergh, Count. Premier of Austria during the war; p. 158.
- Südekum, Albert. At one time leading German social democrat and member of Reichstag; p. 152.
- Sun-Yat-Sen, Dr., 1867-1925. Leader of republican movement in China after 1895. Founder of Chinese nationalist movement; p. 355.
- Swales, A. B., 1870—. Member of Amalgamated Engineering Union of England since 1890. Socialist; p. 336.
- Sylvis, William H., 1828-1869. American labor leader; p. 44.

- Tarnow, Fritz. President of Woodworkers' Union of Germany and leading member of the German Federation of Trade Unions; p. 476.
- Tayerle, R. President of the "free" trade union federation of Czechoslovakia; p. 367.
- Thalheimer. German communist; pp. 252; 311.
- Thälmann, Ernest, 1866—. At one time member of German Social Democratic Party and of Transport Workers' Union. One of organizers of the Spartacus Bund during the war. Leader of German Communist Party. Communist candidate for the German Presidency in 1925; p. 320.
- Thomas, Albert, 1878—. French socialist since 1904. Minister of Munitions during the war. Director of the I. L. O. since 1919; pp. 152; 166; 217; 260; 382; 485.
- Thomas, J. H., 1873—. Secretary of British Railwaymen's Union. Member of Parliament. Secretary Colonial Office in the MacDonald Government in 1924; pp. 232; 309; 336; 411.
- Thompson, William, 1775-1833. Follower of Bentham and Robert Owen. Published in 1824 a volume under the title *Inquiries into the Principles of the Distribution of Wealth Most Conducive to Human Happiness*; p. 12.
- Tillett, Benjamin, 1860—. British labor leader and socialist. Known as great orator and strike organizer; pp. 66; 121.
- Tobin, Daniel J., 1875—. President of the Brotherhood of Teamsters since 1907. Treasurer of American Federation of Labor from 1917 to 1928; pp. 191; 290.
- Tolain, Henri L., 1828-1897. French worker and follower of Proudhon. Member of French Senate in later years of his life; pp. 33; 35.

- Tomsky, Michael, 1880—. Russian socialist and trade unionist since 1905. Chairman of the All-Russian Central Trade Union Council since 1919. Member of Executive Committee of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, and of the Central Committee of the Russian Communist Party; pp. 230; 246; 314; 322; 337.
- Trevino, Ricardo, 1895—. Mexican labor leader and socialist. Secretary of the Mexican Labor Party since 1923; pp. 285; 287.
- Tristan, Flora, 1813-1844. French feminist and socialist writer; p. 23.
- Trotsky, Leon (Bronstein), 1879—. With Lenin organizer and leader of Bolshevik Revolution. Organizer of Soviet Red Army; pp. 153; 163; 312; 339; 340; 351; 358; 362-3; 383; 528.
- Turati, Filippo, 1857—. Leader of Italian Socialist Party until Fascist revolution; pp. 74; 78; 150.
- Urbahns. German communist; pp. 340; 352; 383.
- Vaillant, Edouard, 1840-1915. French socialist. Member of Chamber of Deputies from 1893 to 1914; pp. 70; 77; 92.
- Vaillant, A. French anarchist. Executed in Paris in 1894; p. 72.
- Vandervelde, Emile, 1866—. Belgian socialist leader. Minister of Justice 1918-1921, and of Foreign Affairs 1925-1926; pp. 138; 151-2; 166; 239; 438.
- Van Kol, Hendric, 1851-1925. Leader of Dutch Socialist Party. Member of parliament; p. 86.
- Vargas, Canuto A. Labor Attaché of Mexican Embassy in Washington in 1925; pp. 287; 291; 374.
- Villa, Francisco, 1868-1923. Mexican revolutionary general. Assassinated in 1923; pp. 282; 284.

Villareal. Mexican revolutionist; p. 278.

Vollmar, Georg von, 1850-1922. German socialist and member of Reichstag for many years. Leader of revisionists; pp. 70; 78.

Walling, William E., 1877—. American writer on socialist and political questions; p. 161.

Webb, Sidney, 1859—. British economist and socialist. President of the Board of Trade in the MacDonald Government; pp. 65; 430.

Weitling, Wilhelm, 1808-1871. German tailor and communist. Migrated to the United States where he published a paper and organized a socialist colony in Wisconsin; p. 19.

Wells, H. G., 1866—. English novelist and socialist; pp. 65; 152.

Wels, Otto, 1875—. German socialist and trade unionist. Commander of city of Berlin in 1918. One of the leaders of the Social Democratic Party in the Reichstag; pp. 212; 437.

Wilhelm II, 1859—. Former Emperor of Germany; p. 95.

Wilson, Joseph Havelock, 1859—. Secretary of the Seamen's Union of England and member of Parliament several times; p. 162.

Wilson, William B., 1862—. First Secretary of Labor of the United States from 1913 to 1921; p. 288.

Wilson, Woodrow, 1862-1924. American statesman. President of the United States 1913-1921; pp. 95; 159; 168; 190; 191; 198; 253; 255-7; 284; 287; 297.

Wolff, L., Major. Secretary to Mazzini; p. 36.

Woll, Matthew, 1880—. President of the Photo-Engravers' Union of North America since 1906. Vice-President of the American Federation of Labor

and Acting President of the Civic Federation; pp. 260; 262; 377.

Wright, Chester M., 1883—. Secretary of Pan-American Federation of Labor, 1921-1927; pp. 161; 385.

Wright, Frances, 1795-1852. English feminist and social reformer. Lived in the United States; pp. 13; 14.

Yudenich, Nicolai, 1862—. Russian general. Led campaign against Soviet Russia in 1920; pp. 212; 213.

Yudico, Samuel O., 1889-1928. At one time secretary of *La Casa del Obrero Mundial* of Mexico; p. 285.

Yvetot, Georges, 1868—. French syndicalist and anarchist. Secretary of the General Confederation of Labor from 1902 to 1914; pp. 127; 129.

Zapata, Emiliano, 1869-1919. Mexican agrarian leader. Fought against Madera, Huerta, and Carranza; p. 282.

Zetkin, Clara, 1857—. German socialist and feminist. Active anti-militarist during the war. Communist member of Reichstag since 1920; pp. 70; 153; 226.

Zinoviev, Gregory (Radomilsky), 1883—. Member Russian Bolshevik Party since 1903. President of the Third International from 1919 to 1926. At one time also President of the Leningrad Soviet; pp. 155; 163; 173; 211; 217; 218; 243; 249; 252; 321; 324; 339-40; 351; 362-3; 383; 523; 528.

INDEX

- Africa, 64, 310, 318, 321, 380, 415, 434, 440-441, 511, 527, 601
- All-Russian Council of Trade Unions, 245-246, 313-315, 329, 336-337, 369, 384, 473, 537
- American Alliance for Labor and Democracy, 161
- American Federation of Labor, 68, 71, 80-81, 100, 103-104, 114, 117-133, 161, 177, 181, 185-187, 190, 196, 233, 244, 253-270, 273-278, 280-286, 288-290, 294-301, 308, 369-374, 378-379, 384-385, 394, 415-416, 603
- American Peace Society, 21
- American trade unions affiliated with Trade Secretariats, 473
- Amsterdam International or "Amsterdam," 202-204, 208-209, 211, 217-219, 231-234, 239, 243-246, 248, 254, 259-264, 267-270, 273-275, 298-300, 308-309, 313-315, 317-319, 322-325, 328, 330-331, 334-337, 339, 363-370, 372, 381-382, 384-386, 389-417, 442-448, 456, 458, 467, 476-478, 485, 489-490, 492-493, 496-499, 531, 533, 536, 557, 559, 577, 595, 598-599, 601, 603
- Anarchism, 58, 68, 72 (see also *Anarcho-Syndicalists*)
- Anarchists, 67-68, 70, 72-73, 81, 230
- Anarcho-Syndicalists, 559-577 (see also *International Working Men's Association*)
- Anglo-Russian Committee, 313-315, 322-323, 336-337, 357, 363, 366, 369, 384, 414
- Anti-militarism, 103, 130, 527, 541
- Argentina, 112, 134, 280, 282, 286, 292, 376, 386, 401, 405, 440, 479, 574, 576
- Armenia, 440
- Asia, 171, 198, 318, 321, 380, 415-416, 434, 441, 493, 511, 527, 601, 615
- Austria, 32, 48, 66, 70, 75, 80, 82, 88-89, 94-95, 98, 102, 106, 108, 115-116, 134, 136, 140, 142, 153, 164, 167, 169-170, 183-184, 191, 193, 203, 205, 207, 218, 236, 305, 317, 390, 413-414, 424, 436, 441, 444-445, 447, 479, 495, 525, 592, 594
- Australia, 29, 112, 134, 268, 325, 327, 380, 394, 415, 440, 473, 481
- Balkans, 57, 75, 213, 221, 249-250, 320, 398, 410, 465, 525, 527, 553
- Baltic States, 218, 320, 525, 527
- Belgium, 11-12, 16-17, 31, 42-44, 46, 50, 55-56, 65, 70, 80, 82, 97, 101-102, 115-116, 134, 136, 138, 142, 152, 181-183, 188, 191-193, 205, 236, 316, 326, 333, 398, 411, 413-414, 417-418, 424, 437-438, 441, 444-445, 447, 462, 486, 495, 525, 591-592, 594

- Bern International or "Bern,"
202, 209-211, 214
- Black International, 68
- Blanquists, 25, 35, 40, 55, 65
- Bolshevik Revolution, 241, 346, 362
- Bolsheviks, 78, 139, 154, 162-163, 165, 168-170, 214, 237, 432, 527
- Bolshevism, 164-165, 167, 170, 225, 313, 428
- Bolshevization, 313, 352, 518
- Brazil, 281-282, 292, 473, 479, 574
- British Federation of Trade Unions, 101, 110, 113, 175-176, 185, 193, 196, 232, 261
- British General Strike, 324-332, 335
- British Labor Party, 138-139, 141, 160-161, 165, 167, 208, 210-211, 244, 321, 384, 418, 436-437, 441
- British Trade Union Congress, 68-69, 100, 104, 117, 119-120, 138, 175, 185, 188, 193, 208, 210-211, 232, 261, 265, 303, 315, 325-326, 329, 334-338, 368, 381, 411
- Bulgaria, 108, 154, 164, 183-184, 213, 232, 250, 312, 495
- Canada, 327, 378, 405, 486, 575
- Canadian Trades and Labor Congress, 129, 131
- Carbonari, 11-12, 16
- Casa del Obrero Mundial, 279, 282-285, 287-288
- Chartists, 16, 19, 22-25, 27, 30, 35
- Chile, 281-282, 286, 292, 295, 480, 495, 576
- China, 94, 201, 215, 305, 310, 317-319, 321, 353-357, 381, 440, 459, 480, 525, 536, 553, 604
- Civil War (in America), 30, 32-33, 41
- Class struggle, 14, 26, 77, 82, 84, 92, 95, 144, 149, 154, 231, 345, 360, 403, 422-423, 425-426, 433, 503, 506-508, 529-530, 534, 562, 571-572, 582, 584-585, 607
- Colombia, 288, 296, 375
- Comintern (see *Third International*)
- Commission on International Labor Legislation, 189-190
- Communist International, 216, 230-231, 240-241 (see also *Third International*)
- Communist League, 25, 27, 30, 35
- Communist Manifesto, 25-27, 37, 173, 425, 498
- Communism, 498, 516
- Communist Youth International, 540-542
- Communist Youth Leagues, 524, 540-542, 546
- Confederacion Regional Obrera Mexicana or C. R. O. M., 285, 287, 289, 293-294, 299, 373-374, 378-379
- Cosmopolitanism, 12, 26, 63, 87
- Costa Rica, 288
- Cuba, 276, 301, 375, 386, 473
- Czechoslovakia, 134, 171, 184, 193, 198, 207, 213, 218, 241, 250, 312, 316, 327, 333, 380, 390-391, 410, 414, 418, 424, 441, 462, 495, 524-525, 536, 542, 548, 553, 591
- Dawes Plan, 305, 310, 318-319, 412, 510
- Denmark, 48, 66, 80, 101-102, 106, 151, 183-184, 193, 317, 384, 414, 417-418, 424, 438, 525
- Diamond Workers' Secretariat, 466
- Dictatorship of the proletariat, 163, 172, 428, 499, 502-507, 510, 512, 515, 529, 530, 560-561, 566
- Direct action, 82, 568, 569-571
- Dominican Republic, 296

- Dutch East Indies, 325, 415, 442, 473
- Ecuador, 294-295
- Egypt, 215, 238, 317, 321, 381, 415, 442
- Eight-hour day, 43, 58, 71, 189, 204, 222, 238, 292, 294, 382, 397, 400, 458, 461, 467, 495
- England, 11, 13-15, 18, 20, 23-24, 27-28, 30-34, 36, 38, 42, 44-45, 48, 63, 65, 67, 70, 74, 78, 80, 83, 91, 94-95, 97-99, 101-103, 106, 108, 113, 119-120, 122, 132, 138, 141, 152-153, 155, 157-158, 162, 165, 175, 180-183, 193, 205, 220, 227, 236, 249, 268-269, 280, 305, 310, 316-317, 321, 324-328, 330, 332, 334, 365, 380, 384-385, 414, 419, 424, 430-432, 436, 443, 446, 486, 510-511, 515, 525, 527, 536, 542, 599
- Esthonia, 438
- Fabian Society, 65, 67, 210
- Far East, 94, 356, 604
- Fascism, 220, 244-246, 251, 310, 324, 382, 390, 410, 492, 597
- Federation of the Just, 19, 24
- Finland, 66, 101, 134, 183, 198, 213, 232, 384, 405, 410, 424, 438
- First International, 63, 67, 85-86, 108, 173, 559
- France, 11-18, 20, 23, 30-31, 33-34, 37, 42-46, 49-52, 55-56, 65-68, 70, 77-78, 80-81, 83, 91, 94-95, 97-98, 101-102, 106, 108, 112, 114-115, 119, 134, 136-138, 141, 152-154, 156, 158, 162, 165, 167-168, 171, 175, 180-184, 188, 191, 193, 205, 213, 221, 223, 234, 236, 241-243, 249, 251, 269, 279, 305, 311, 316, 320, 326-327, 329, 380, 383-384, 396, 398, 410-411, 413-414, 419, 424, 432, 436, 438, 441, 462, 486, 495, 510-511, 515, 524-525, 527, 536, 542, 548, 553, 559-561, 574-576, 591-592
- Free trade, 21-22, 26, 38, 57, 63, 605
- French Communist Party, 240, 243, 312
- French Confederation of Labor, 81, 103, 114, 127, 130, 133, 174, 176, 178, 180, 185, 188, 196, 206, 241
- French Confederation of United Labor, 240-241, 560
- French Socialist Party, 86, 158, 160, 165, 167, 185, 214, 223, 243, 318, 419, 441
- General strike, 49, 58, 72, 82, 85, 90-92, 103, 130, 432, 548, 566-568, 570
- German Communist Party, 223, 226, 248, 252, 311, 320
- Georgia (in the Caucasus), 218, 237-238
- Germany, 11-12, 18, 23, 27, 30-33, 37, 42, 47, 50, 54, 56-57, 65-66, 70, 75, 77-78, 80, 82, 91, 97-102, 106-109, 112, 115-116, 119, 122, 132, 134, 136-137, 140-141, 143, 151-156, 158, 163-164, 167, 169-170, 175-177, 179-180, 183-184, 191-193, 200, 203, 207, 211-213, 218, 221-223, 226-227, 233-234, 239-240, 242, 247, 249, 251-252, 280, 305-306, 311, 316-317, 320, 326-327, 329, 333, 351, 362, 380, 382-383, 390-391, 396, 411-414, 417-419, 424, 434, 436, 438, 443-445, 447, 462, 479, 486, 510-511, 515, 524-525, 536, 542, 553, 559, 561, 574-576, 579, 591-592, 594, 596, 599
- Gosplan, 353, 358-359
- Grand National Consolidated Trades Union, 15-17

- Great Britain (see *England*)
 Greece, 401, 495
 Group of Communist Education, 23-24
 Guatemala, 288, 296, 298, 375, 480
 Guesdists, 65-66, 69-70
- Hairdressers' Secretariat, 452, 455
 Holland, 24, 48, 70, 80, 82, 99, 102, 106, 108, 112, 115-116, 140, 142, 151, 154, 179, 183-184, 191, 193, 196, 205, 213, 242, 326, 380, 391, 411, 414, 418, 441, 444, 447, 475, 490, 525, 559, 576, 578-579, 591-592, 594, 596
 Honduras, 375
 Hotel Workers' Secretariat, 466
 Hungary, 24, 48, 52, 75, 80, 82, 134, 142, 164, 169, 183-184, 206-207, 213, 218, 305, 410, 417-418, 424, 525
- Imperialism, 172, 209, 296, 310, 377, 457, 499, 507-512, 611
 Inaugural address, 36, 38-39
 Independent Labor Party of Great Britain, 79-80, 138, 153, 155, 157, 172, 214, 223, 323-324, 385, 429-430
 Independent Socialists of Germany, 158, 164, 172, 212, 214, 223, 227, 244, 251
 India, 201, 215, 238, 310, 317, 321, 325, 327, 367, 381, 415, 440, 442, 459, 473, 486, 495-496, 553, 604
 Industrial Workers of the World (I. W. W.), 81, 129-130, 208, 215, 229-230, 279-280, 283, 290, 292-293, 575
 Inter-Allied Supreme Council, 203, 205-206
 International Alliance of Social Democracy, 47
 International Association for Labor Legislation, 64, 114-115, 134
 International Association for Social Progress, 598
 International boycotts, 468
 International Brotherhood, 47
 International cartels, 397, 460, 472, 509, 604
 International Children's Bureau, 541
 International Clothing Workers' Federation, 449
 International Co-operative Alliance, 540
 International Correspondence Bureau, 179, 188-189
 International Federation of Boot and Shoe Operatives, 449
 International Federation of Christian Trade Unions, 202, 328, 381, 490, 578-601, 603
 International Federation of Commercial, Clerical, and Technical Employees, 452
 International Federation of Food and Drink Workers, 309, 449, 452, 463, 468, 473
 International Federation of Metal Workers, 309, 449, 456, 476
 International Federation of Trade Unions (I. F. T. U.), 105-106, 110, 126-127, 130-131, 134, 174-196, 203, 206-208, 231-234, 245-248, 253-255, 261-262, 264-266, 269-270, 274, 308-310, 313-315, 323, 327, 329, 331-332, 337, 368, 372-373, 382, 395, 448, 472 (see also *Amsterdam International*)
 International Federation of Transport Workers, 207-208, 309, 326-328, 330-333, 452, 454, 456-457, 468
 International Labor Charter, 188, 190, 194, 397, 467

- International Labor Convention, 191, 193, 291
- International Labor Office (pre-war), 115
- International Labor Office (of the League of Nations), 191, 370, 415, 445, 479, 483-485, 487, 490, 493, 496, 601
- International Labor Organization (of the League of Nations), 191, 203, 209, 211, 217, 253, 257, 259-260, 382, 393, 395, 399, 478-497, 569, 578, 598, 599, 603
- International Left Communist Federation, 361
- International Miners' Federation, 98, 325-326, 328, 331-333, 336, 454, 456, 468
- International Peasants' Council, 537-539
- International Red Aid, 543-545
- International Secretariat of Trade Union Centers, 100-115, 126, 128, 130-133, 196
- International Secretariat of Christian Labor Unions, 64, 115-116
- International Socialist Bureau, 84-85, 87, 92-93, 127, 136, 138, 140, 150-151, 153, 156-157, 159, 166
- International Socialist Commission, 156
- International strikes, 325, 333, 468, 570, 609-610
- International strike funds, 108, 130, 468-469
- International Trade Secretariats, 64, 97-99, 107, 112-113, 125-126, 133-134, 205, 232, 245, 309, 363-365, 368, 373, 381, 384, 399, 448-477, 493, 531-532, 603
- International Union of Building Trades Workers, 234, 449, 455-456, 465
- International Union of Woodworkers, 476
- International Workers' Relief, 543-545
- International Working Men's Association (I. W. M. A.), 242, 293, 298, 381, 559-577
- International Working Union of Socialist Parties, 234, 236, 245 (see *Two-and-a-Half International*; also *Vienna Union*)
- Internationalism, 1-5, 19, 58, 87-88, 112, 150, 152, 178, 395-396, 412, 418, 433, 439, 566, 603, 605, 613-615, 617
- Ireland, 14, 238, 257, 405
- Italy, 11-12, 18, 23, 32, 47, 55-57, 66, 68, 70, 75, 78, 80, 83, 96, 97, 101, 106, 108, 112, 115-116, 134, 136, 142, 150, 153-154, 157, 162, 165-166, 181-182, 207, 212-214, 219, 221, 223, 226, 240-241, 244, 269, 280, 312, 320, 382, 398-399, 405, 410, 419, 424, 462, 465, 486, 495, 525, 527, 553, 559, 576, 594, 599
- Japan, 57, 86, 93, 201, 215, 220, 305, 325, 381, 459, 486, 496, 511
- Jewish Fund, 154, 170, 429
- Kellogg Pact, 306
- Kienthal, 157
- Korea, 215
- Kuo-Min-Tang, 355-356
- Labor and Socialist International (see *Socialist International*)
- Labor Monroe Doctrine, 273, 298, 300
- Latin America, 94, 201, 213, 253-254, 275, 286, 293, 301, 385, 410, 415, 473, 511, 527, 575, 604, 615
- Latin-American Federation, 386
- Latin-American Secretariat of Labor, 384, 532

- Latin-American Syndicalist Federation, 386
 Latvia, 232, 424, 438, 495
 League of Nations, 2, 168, 171, 189, 193-195, 203, 208, 211, 233-234, 247-248, 257, 262, 289, 294, 306, 370, 397, 400, 403-404, 412, 433-435, 438, 441-442, 472, 479-480, 483, 487-488, 491-492, 497, 511-512, 516, 569, 599
 Leninism, 312, 499, 549 (see *Lenin*)
 Liberalism, 12, 32, 37, 63, 95, 581-582
 L'Internationale, 58
 Lithuania, 198, 401, 410
 Locarno Pact, 306, 316, 318, 437
 London Trades' Council, 31-32, 34, 41
 London Working Men's Association, 16-17
 Lucerne Sports International, 417, 444-447
 Luxemburg, 193, 398
 Majority Socialists, 152-153, 156-157, 164-165, 167, 181, 210, 212, 244, 251
 May Day, 71, 118, 206
 Mensheviks, 78, 154, 170, 424
 Mexico, 94, 277-279, 282-284, 286-288, 290-293, 296-297, 299-300, 325, 327, 373-374, 378, 385, 415
 Migration, 3, 38, 45, 88-89, 109, 130, 181, 285, 289, 290-291, 294, 296, 374-375, 378-379, 397-398, 441, 458, 462-463, 465, 470-471, 604-605, 612
 Minority Socialists, 153, 156, 158, 165
 Morocco, 317, 319-321
 "Moscow" (see *Third International*)
 Mutualists, 43, 49-50
 National Labor Union, 44-45, 47, 50, 117
 National Union of the Working Classes, 14-15, 17
 Nationalism, 26, 57, 63, 88, 566, 602, 604-605, 615
 Nationalization, 49, 200, 256, 424, 431, 440, 502
 Near East, 20, 94, 201
 New Economic Policy (N. E. P.), 225-226, 228, 241-242, 340-343, 348, 560
 New Zealand, 325
 Nicaragua, 294, 297-298, 373, 375, 377, 480
 Norway, 80, 101-102, 106, 108, 142, 151, 155, 183-184, 191, 193, 241, 380, 384, 405, 410, 417, 424, 446, 480, 525
 Palestine, 367, 405
 Panama, 375
 Pan-American Federation of Labor, 291-295, 297-298, 300-301, 339, 373, 375-376, 385-386, 394
 Pan-Pacific Secretariat of Labor, 356, 384, 532
 Paraguay, 480
 Paris Commune, 51, 56, 65
 Peace (see *war and peace*)
 Peace Conference, 166, 177, 181, 187, 189-190, 478 (see also *Versailles Treaty*)
 Peace Treaty, 168, 181, 184, 189, 191, 194, 203, 479 (see also *Versailles Treaty*)
 Persia, 215
 Peru, 286, 292, 294-295, 375-376, 480
 Plumb Plan, 256, 259, 262, 267
 Poland, 12, 18, 27, 42, 154, 198, 207, 213, 250, 263, 312, 316, 333, 380, 383, 391, 418, 424, 438, 462, 495, 525, 527, 553, 591
 Porto Rico, 276-277, 296-297, 301, 375
 Portugal, 47, 405, 410, 559, 574-575
 Profintern (see *R. I. L. U.*)

- Rationalization, 306, 397, 431, 510
- Red International of Labor Unions (R. I. L. U.), 229-232, 241-244, 269, 271, 293, 298, 313, 314, 319, 321-322, 324, 328, 336, 356, 381, 384, 530-537, 557, 560, 577
- Red Sports International, 542-543
- Reparations, 209, 221, 233-235, 248, 305, 400, 433, 438, 510
- Ruhr, 205, 213, 221, 243, 245-249, 318, 328, 332-333, 400, 465
- Rumania, 154, 166, 198, 417, 462, 495
- Russia, 28, 32, 57, 66, 70, 75, 83, 89-90, 94-95, 116, 136, 139, 141, 160, 162-163, 165, 168-170, 198, 200, 214, 218, 221-223, 225-226, 228, 235, 237-239, 257-258, 263, 268, 308, 314, 320, 329, 339-354, 358-362, 365, 383, 390, 405, 414, 428, 495, 502, 512, 514-515, 524, 536, 541, 545, 547, 551, 554-557, 560, 577, 597 (see also *Soviet Russia*; also *U. S. S. R.*)
- Russian Communist Party, 170, 241, 312, 320, 340-341, 346, 348, 350-352, 358, 362-363, 524, 529, 549, 551, 554-555, 557
- Russian Revolution, 159, 162-163, 174, 197-198, 238, 346, 508
- Salvador, 288, 294, 296, 298, 375, 430
- San Domingo, 294, 297, 375 (see also *Dominican Republic*)
- Scandinavia, 24, 75, 82, 112, 319, 441, 444, 447, 576 (see also *Denmark*, *Norway*, and *Sweden*)
- Second International, 63-98, 100-101, 104, 118, 120, 123, 134-136, 139-142, 145-146, 149, 153, 156, 168, 173, 202, 209-210, 217, 223, 225, 234, 236-238, 244-245, 247, 258, 280, 418, 440, 558
- Secret societies, 15, 18-19, 40, 47
- Serbia, 108, 136, 139, 166
- Social Democratic Federation (of England), 65-66, 79
- Social revolution, 49, 53, 67-68, 72, 74, 76-77, 82, 135, 350, 499-501, 614
- Social Revolutionists, 154, 170, 237-239
- Socialism, 12, 53, 58, 65-66, 68, 73, 78-84, 86, 90, 135, 193, 607 (see also *Socialist International*)
- Socialist Labor Party of America, 66, 79, 119, 171
- Socialist Party of America, 79, 81, 141, 151, 159, 161, 186, 224, 258, 273
- Socialist International, 245, 318, 324, 331, 381-382, 395, 400, 416-447, 520, 540, 558, 603
- Socialist Youth International, 417, 444-447
- Socialization, 84, 169, 195, 200, 205-206, 209-210, 263-266, 419, 422-423, 440, 457
- South Africa, 112, 325, 367, 381, 405, 415, 493
- Southwest Africa, 401, 405
- Soviet Russia, 205, 251, 266, 305, 341, 344, 346, 349, 357, 419, 432, 510-511, 514, 528, 551, 561, 566
- Soviets, 169, 172, 212, 216, 219-220, 238, 250, 504
- Spain, 11, 47, 52, 55-56, 68, 70, 83, 97, 102, 182, 191, 193, 213, 221, 276, 279-280, 320, 418, 479, 525, 559, 574-576
- Spartacus Bund, 158, 164, 211-212
- Sweden, 66, 80, 101-102, 106, 116, 134, 142, 151, 155, 159, 167, 179, 183-184, 191, 193,

- 213, 218, 223, 242, 305, 312,
316-317, 380, 384, 418, 424,
438, 462, 525, 542, 559, 575
- Switzerland, 42-46, 55-56, 66, 71,
75, 80, 82, 99, 102, 112, 115-
116, 134, 142, 154, 166, 176,
178, 183-184, 191, 193, 212,
214, 413-414, 424, 465, 474, 525,
591, 596
- Syndicalism, 58, 81-82, 103, 114,
141, 280, 559-571, 581-582, 585,
603
- Syria, 310, 317, 321
- Third International, 149-174,
202, 211-219, 223-226, 228, 231,
234-238, 240-241, 243-244, 248-
252, 258, 263, 269, 271, 310-
312, 319-322, 324, 320, 339,
348, 350-352, 355-357, 361-363,
381, 383, 517-558, 560, 577,
603, 616
- Trade Union Educational
League, 271-273, 370, 532
- Turkey, 94, 96, 215, 440
- Two-and-a-Half International,
223-225, 244-245, 247
- Union Soviet Socialist Repub-
lics (U. S. S. R.), 554 (see
Russia)
- United Front, 234-235, 238, 240-
243, 245, 271, 311, 313, 320,
352, 383, 535, 546
- United Mine Workers of
America, 255, 268, 272, 372
- United States of America, 11-
15, 20, 24, 28-30, 32-33, 37, 44,
46-48, 57, 66, 68-69, 71, 75,
79-80, 83, 94-95, 97, 102, 106,
108, 122, 124, 132, 134, 141,
159, 163, 171, 175, 177, 182,
191-193, 200, 208, 213, 220-221,
223, 239, 241, 271, 279-281,
286, 288-290, 296, 306, 325,
354, 374, 376, 378-380, 385,
418, 436, 440, 473, 482, 510-
511, 515, 525, 536, 542, 548,
559, 575-576, 599, 601
- Uruguay, 281-282, 386
- Venezuela, 375, 377, 386
- Versailles Treaty, 190, 194, 198,
204, 237, 257, 262, 290, 439,
482, 598, 615
- War and peace, 3, 89-92, 123-
124, 397, 433-434, 446, 457-
458, 482, 509, 511-515, 538,
541, 562, 569, 604, 612, 614-616
- Workers' Party of America, 271
- World revolution, 149, 169-170,
211, 215, 512-515, 527, 549,
555-556
- Yugoslavia, 198, 232, 495
- Zimmerwald, 153-157, 159, 163,
171, 180
- Zimmerwald Commission, 156-
157, 161, 171 (see *Interna-
tional Socialist Commission*)

Publications of the Brookings Institution

THE INSTITUTE OF ECONOMICS

(Titles starred are publications of the McGraw-Hill Company; all others are published by The Macmillan Company.)

***GERMANY'S CAPACITY TO PAY.**

By Harold G. Moulton and Constantine E. McGuire.
1923. \$2.50. 384 pp.

***RUSSIAN DEBTS AND RUSSIAN RECONSTRUCTION.**

By Leo Pasvolsky and Harold G. Moulton. 1924.
\$2.50. 247 pp.

***THE REPARATAION PLAN.**

By Harold G. Moulton. 1924. \$2.50. 325 pp.

THE FRENCH DEBT PROBLEM.

By Harold G. Moulton and Cleona Lewis. 1925.
\$2.00. 459 pp.

THE RUHR-LORRAINE INDUSTRIAL PROBLEM.

By Guy Greer. 1925. \$2.50. 328 pp.

WORLD WAR DEBT SETTLEMENTS.

By Harold G. Moulton and Leo Pasvolsky. 1926.
\$2.00. 448 pp.

ITALY'S INTERNATIONAL ECONOMIC POSITION.

By Constantine E. McGuire. 1926. \$3.00. 588 pp.

THE INTERNATIONAL ACCOUNTS.

By Cleona Lewis. 1927. \$2.00. 170 pp.

AMERICAN LOANS TO GERMANY.

By Robert R. Kuczynski. 1927. \$3.00. 378 pp.

ECONOMIC NATIONALISM OF THE DANUBIAN STATES.

By Leo Pasvolsky. 1928. \$3.00. 609 pp.

*MAKING THE TARIFF IN THE UNITED STATES.

By Thomas Walker Page. 1924. \$2.50. 281 pp.

*SUGAR IN RELATION TO THE TARIFF.

By Philip G. Wright. 1924. \$2.50. 312 pp.

THE TARIFF ON WOOL.

By Mark A. Smith. 1926. \$2.50. 350 pp.

THE CATTLE INDUSTRY AND THE TARIFF.

By Lynn R. Edminster. 1926. \$2.50. 331 pp.

THE TARIFF ON ANIMAL AND VEGETABLE OILS.

By Philip G. Wright. 1928. \$2.50. 347 pp.

*AMERICAN AGRICULTURE AND THE EUROPEAN MARKET.

By Edwin G. Nourse. 1924. \$2.50. 333 pp.

THE FEDERAL INTERMEDIATE CREDIT SYSTEM.

By Claude L. Benner. 1926. \$2.50. 375 pp.

FINANCING THE LIVESTOCK INDUSTRY.

By Forrest M. Larmer. 1926. \$2.50. 327 pp.

INDUSTRIAL PROSPERITY AND THE FARMER.

By Russell C. Engberg. 1927. \$2.50. 286 pp.

THE LEGAL STATUS OF AGRICULTURAL CO-OPERATION.

By Edwin G. Nourse. 1927. \$3.00. 555 pp.

THE MEXICAN AGRARIAN REVOLUTION.

By Frank Tannenbaum. 1929. 2.50. 543 pp.

*MINERS' WAGES AND THE COST OF COAL.

By Isador Lubin. 1924. \$2.50. 316 pp.

THE CASE OF BITUMINOUS COAL.

By Walton H. Hamilton and Helen R. Wright. 1925.
\$2.50. 310 pp.

THE COAL MINERS' STRUGGLE FOR INDUSTRIAL STATUS.

By Arthur E. Suffern. 1926. \$2.50. 462 pp.

WORKERS' HEALTH AND SAFETY: A STATISTICAL PROGRAM.
By Robert Morse Woodbury. 1927. \$2.50. 207 pp.

THE BRITISH COAL DILEMMA.

By Isador Lubin and Helen Everett. 1927. \$2.50.
370 pp.

A WAY OF ORDER FOR BITUMINOUS COAL.

By Walton H. Hamilton and Helen R. Wright. 1928.
\$2.50. 365 pp.

LABOR AND INTERNATIONALISM.

By Lewis L. Lorwin. 1929. \$3.00. 682 pp.

INTEREST RATES AND STOCK SPECULATION.

By Richard N. Owens and Charles O. Hardy. 1925.
\$2.00. 197 pp.

TAX-EXEMPT SECURITIES AND THE SURTAX.

By Charles O. Hardy. 1926. \$2.00. 216 pp.

THE BALANCE OF BIRTHS AND DEATHS.

By Robert R. Kuczynski. 1928. \$2.00. 140 pp.

INSTITUTE FOR GOVERNMENT RESEARCH

(Published by the Johns Hopkins Press.)

Studies in Administration

THE SYSTEM OF FINANCIAL ADMINISTRATION OF GREAT
BRITAIN.

By W. F. Willoughby, W. W. Willoughby, and S. M.
Lindsay. 378 pp. \$3.00. 1917.

THE BUDGET: A TRANSLATION.

By Rene Stourm. 648 pp. \$4.00. 1917.

THE CANADIAN BUDGETARY SYSTEM.

By H. C. Villard and W. W. Willoughby. 390 pp.
\$3.00. 1918.

THE PROBLEM OF A NATIONAL BUDGET.

By W. F. Willoughby. 234 pp. \$3.00. 1918.

THE NATIONAL BUDGET SYSTEM, WITH SUGGESTIONS FOR ITS IMPROVEMENT.

By W. F. Willoughby. 359 pp. \$3.00. 1927.

THE MOVEMENT FOR BUDGETARY REFORM IN THE STATES.

By W. F. Willoughby. 266 pp. \$3.00. 1918.

THE LEGAL STATUS AND FUNCTIONS OF THE GENERAL ACCOUNTING OFFICE.

By W. F. Willoughby. 204 pp. \$3.00. 1927.

MANUAL OF ACCOUNTING AND REPORTING FOR THE OPERATING SERVICES OF THE NATIONAL GOVERNMENT.

By Henry P. Seidemann. 421 pp. \$5.00. 1926.

MANUAL OF ACCOUNTING, REPORTING, AND BUSINESS PROCEDURE FOR THE TERRITORIAL GOVERNMENT OF HAWAII.

By Henry P. Seidemann. 598 pp. \$5.00. 1928.

THE DEVELOPMENT OF NATIONAL ADMINISTRATIVE ORGANIZATION IN THE UNITED STATES.

By Lloyd M. Short. 531 pp. \$5.00. 1923.

THE REORGANIZATION OF THE ADMINISTRATIVE BRANCH OF THE NATIONAL GOVERNMENT.

By W. F. Willoughby. 314 pp. \$3.00. 1922.

THE FEDERAL SERVICE: A STUDY OF THE SYSTEM OF PERSONNEL ADMINISTRATION OF THE UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT.

By Lewis Mayers. 624 pp. \$5.00. 1922.

THE STATISTICAL WORK OF THE NATIONAL GOVERNMENT.

By Laurence F. Schmeckebier. 590 pp. \$5.00. 1925.

THE NATIONAL GOVERNMENT AND PUBLIC HEALTH.

By James A. Tobey. 441 pp. \$3.00. 1926.

THE DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE OF THE UNITED STATES.

By Albert Langeluttig. 334 pp. \$3.00. 1927.

THE PROBLEM OF INDIAN ADMINISTRATION.

By Lewis Meriam and Associates. 894 pp. \$5.00.
1928.

THE DEVELOPMENT OF GOVERNMENTAL FOREST CONTROL
IN THE UNITED STATES.

By Jenks Cameron. 480 pp. \$3.00. 1928.

ORGANIZED EFFORTS FOR THE IMPROVEMENT OF METHODS
OF ADMINISTRATION IN THE UNITED STATES.

By Gustavus A. Weber. 408 pp. \$3.00. 1919.

TEACHERS' PENSION SYSTEMS IN THE UNITED STATES.

By Paul Studensky. 474 pp. \$3.00. 1921.

THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA; ITS GOVERNMENT AND
ADMINISTRATION.

By Laurence F. Schmeckebier. 963 pp. \$5.00. 1928.

THE GOVERNMENT AND ADMINISTRATION OF GERMANY.

By Frederick F. Blachly and Miriam F. Oatman.
784 pp. \$5.00. 1928.

GROUP REPRESENTATION BEFORE CONGRESS.

By E. Pendleton Herring. (In Press.)

Principles of Administration

PRINCIPLES OF PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION.

By W. F. Willoughby. 742 pp. \$5.00. 1927.

PRINCIPLES OF GOVERNMENT ACCOUNTING AND REPORT-
ING.

By Francis Oakey. 582 pp. \$5.00. 1921.

PRINCIPLES OF GOVERNMENT PURCHASING.

By Arthur G. Thomas. 290 pp. \$3.00. 1919.

PRINCIPLES OF PUBLIC PERSONNEL ADMINISTRATION.

By Arthur W. Procter. 256 pp. \$3.00. 1921.

PRINCIPLES GOVERNING THE RETIREMENT OF PUBLIC
EMPLOYEES.

By Lewis Meriam. 508 pp. \$3.00. 1918.

Service Monographs on the United States Government

1. Geological Survey. 174 pp. Out of print. 1918.
2. Reclamation Service. 190 pp. Out of print. 1919.
3. Bureau of Mines. 174 pp. \$1.00. 1922.
4. Alaskan Engineering Commission. 134 pp. \$1.00. 1922.
5. Tariff Commission. 84 pp. \$1.00. 1922.
6. Federal Board for Vocational Education. 86 pp. \$1.00. 1922.
7. Federal Trade Commission. 92 pp. \$1.00. 1922.
8. Steam-boat Inspection Service. 142 pp. \$1.00. 1922.
9. Weather Bureau. 100 pp. \$1.00. 1922.
10. Public Health Service. 312 pp. \$2.00. 1923.
11. National Park Service. 184 pp. \$1.00. 1922.
12. Employees' Compensation Commission. 98 pp. \$1.00. 1922.
13. General Land Office. 236 pp. \$1.50. 1923.
14. Bureau of Education. 172 pp. \$1.00. 1923.
15. Bureau of Navigation. 136 pp. \$1.00. 1923.
16. Coast and Geodetic Survey. 120 pp. \$1.00. 1923.
17. Federal Power Commission. 138 pp. \$1.00. 1923.
18. Interstate Commerce Commission. 182 pp. \$1.00. 1923.
19. Railroad Labor Board. 96 pp. \$1.00. 1923.
20. Division of Conciliation. 48 pp. \$1.00. 1923.
21. Children's Bureau. 95 pp. \$1.00. 1925.
22. Women's Bureau. 44 pp. \$1.00. 1923.
23. Office of the Supervising Architect. 150 pp. \$1.00. 1923.
24. Bureau of Pensions. 150 pp. \$1.00. 1923.
25. Bureau of Internal Revenue. 283 pp. \$1.50. 1923.
26. Bureau of Public Roads. 134 pp. \$1.00. 1923.
27. Office of the Chief of Engineers. 178 pp. \$1.00. 1923.
28. United States Employment Service. 142 pp. \$1.00. 1923.

29. Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce. 192 pp. \$1.00. 1924.
30. Bureau of Immigration. 260 pp. \$1.50. 1924.
31. Patent Office. 139 pp. \$1.00. 1924.
32. Office of Experiment Stations. 190 pp. \$1.00. 1924.
33. Customs Service. 203 pp. \$1.50. 1924.
34. Federal Farm Loan Bureau. 171 pp. \$1.00. 1924.
35. Bureau of Standards. 314 pp. \$2.00. 1925.
36. Government Printing Office. 155 pp. \$1.00. 1925.
37. Bureau of the Mint. 102 pp. \$1.00. 1926.
38. Office of the Comptroller of the Currency. 96 pp. \$1.00. 1926.
39. Naval Observatory 113 pp. \$1.00. 1926.
40. Lighthouse Service. 170 pp. \$1.00. 1926.
41. Bureau of Animal Industry. 202 pp. \$1.50. 1927.
42. Hydrographic Office. 124 pp. \$1.00. 1926.
43. Bureau of Naturalization. 120 pp. \$1.00. 1926.
44. Panama Canal. 430 pp. \$2.50. 1927.
45. Medical Department of the Army. 173 pp. \$1.50. 1927.
46. General Accounting Office. 227 pp. \$1.50. 1927.
47. Bureau of Plant Industry. 133 pp. \$1.00. 1927.
48. Office of Indian Affairs. 605 pp. \$3.00. 1927.
49. United States Civil Service Commission. 165 pp. \$1.50. 1928.
50. Food, Drug, and Insecticide Administration. 146 pp. \$1.50. 1928.
51. Coast Guard. 270 pp. \$1.50. 1929.
52. Bureau of Chemistry and Soils. 231 pp. \$1.50. 1928.
53. Bureau of the Census. (In Press.)
54. Bureau of Biological Survey. 349 pp. \$2.00. 1929.
55. Bureau of Dairy Industry. (In Press.)
56. Bureau of Engineering and Printing. (In Press.)

Date Due

N 24 '33			
My 8 '34			
N 18 '35			
Ap - 2 '36			
D 1 5 '37			
N 26 '38			
Ja 28 '39			
O 10 '39			
O 24 '39			
D 1 5 '39			
D 1 5 '39			
Ja 27 '40			
My 7 '41			
Ag 22 '44			
NY 1047			
NY 145			
APR 11			
MAY 12 1945			
②			

331.87
L895

60393

331.87
L895

60393

CONNECTICUT COLLEGE LIBRARY
331.87 L895
Labor and internationalism,

dc



3 1839 002171183

